DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 280 IR 009 542

TITLE	Information for the 1980's. Final Report of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979.
INSTITUTION	National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE	Apr 80
NOTE	802p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (1980 0-324-838:QL3).
EDRS PRICE	MF05/PC33 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conferences; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; *Information Services; *Library Services; *National Programs; *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS	*White House Conference Library Info Services

ABSTRACT

These proceedings of the 1979 White House Conference on Library and Information Services contain resolutions which are the basis for the proposed National Library and Information Services Program and for new national legislation. The resolutions reflect (1) the need to reshape library and information services in order to make them more responsive to the people served, (2) the call for local control of services, and (3) the demand for economy and accountability in public agencies. Transcripts of speeches, open hearings, and the joint congressional hearing include the following: Personal Needs by Clara S. Jones; Lifelong Learning by Francis Keppel; Organizations and the Professions by Herbert D. Benington; Governing Society by Major R. Owens; and International Cooperation and Understanding by Bernard Ostry. Also presented are conference highlights, an outline of the proposed national program, an outline of proposed national legislation, an overview of the conference, and a list of participants. Appendices include the conference rules, resolutions not passed, the conference agenda, statistics, Conference via Computer by Elaine B. Kerr, and a list of conference publications and media. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206280

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INFORMATION FOR THE 1980's

FINAL REPORT OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES, 1979

IR009342

The views and opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position or policy of either the White House Conference staff or the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1717 K Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C., 20036

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Charles Benton (Chairman)
Bessie Boehm Moore (Vice Chairman)
Helmut Alpers
*Joseph Becker
Daniel J. Boorstin
Robert W. Burns, Jr.
Carlos A. Cuadra
Joan H. Gross
Clara S. Jones
Francis Keppel
Marian P. Leith
Frances H. Naftalin
Philip A. Sprague
Horace E. Tate
*John E. Velde, Jr.
Margaret S. Warden
+William J. Welsh
Mildred E. Younger

*Term expired in July 1979. Served in consulting capacity during the Conference and until February 1980.
+Serves in the absence of the Librarian of Congress.

The White House Conference Advisory Committee

Charles Benton (Chairman)
Bessie Boehm Moore (Vice Chairman)
Gregory H. Adamian
C.E. Campbell Beall
Rebecca T. Bingham
Robert Lee Chartrand
Shirley Echelman
Honorable William D. Ford
Marian G. Gallagher
Robert M. Hayes
Esther Mae Henke
Warren Gardiner Hill
Alice B. Ihrig
Honorable Jacob K. Javits
Nicholas Johnson
Rose Marie Lopez
Michael A. McCarroll
Margaret C. McNamara
Edward J. Meade, Jr.
Helen H. Meyer
John T. Short
Joseph F. Shubert
Jeanne Hurley Simon
Philip A. Sprague
Carlton J. Thaxton
John E. Velde, Jr.
Margaret S. Warden
Virginia G. Young

The White House Conference—Staff

Marilyn K. Gell (Executive Director)
Jerry Manolatos (Deputy Director)
Richard G. Akeroyd, Jr.
Charles Culhane
Vera Hirschberg
Thomas G. Lennox
Peggy McLaughlin
Heather L. Nicoll
Kathleen Salata Smith
Jean-Anne South

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science — Staff

Alphonse F. Trezza (Executive Director)
Douglas S. Price
Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar
Ruth Liepmann Tighe
Ruby O. Woods-Robinson

The Committee of the Conference

Gordon M. Ambach
Robert Michael Braude
Howard W. Dillon
Duane F. Johnson
Janet Risha London
Nancy M. Lorenzi
Delia E. Martinez
Robert Lee Navarro
William Walter Pearson
Marcus D. Salazar

The
White House
Conference
on Library
and
Information
Services

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20005

Dear Mr. President:

I have the honor to transmit for your consideration the final report of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

I want to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the thousands of persons who participated in the Conference for your strong support of its objectives and for your words to the delegates.

This report documents the ideas and hopes of millions of Americans who want to meet the future library and information services needs of our Nation.

Your recent appointment of a 13-member Interagency Task Force to study the report indicates to me the high priority you have set for the goals of the Conference.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science stands ready to assist you in any way possible to transform the recommendations of the Conference into reality.

On behalf of the National Commission and the Conference participants, I wish to thank you for your support and cooperation. We look forward to your recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Benton

Charles Benton
Chairman, White House Conference on Library and Information Services
Chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

The resolutions passed by the delegates to the first White House Conference dealing with library and information services are the core of this report. They are the basis for the proposed National Library and Information Services Program and new national legislation contained in the report. These resolutions represent a true grass roots expression of the Nation's library and information services' future needs. They are the result of the involvement of more than 100,000 people across the Nation participating for two and one-half years before the Conference in research, planning, and discussions on what people really need, now and in the future, from library and information services.

Several underlying themes are evident in the resolutions. These themes reflect larger societal trends and indicate significant future directions in our society. First, the delegates clearly saw a need to reshape library and information services in order to make these services more responsive to the people served. Second, there was a strong call for local control. This seems to be an expression of new community interest that is developing throughout the country in many areas of activity. The current move toward Federal deregulation of many industries is an additional demonstration of the trend toward less Federal and more local control. Third, there was a demand for economy and accountability in public agencies. The delegates felt that it was very important for agencies to provide services in a more efficient and cost-effective manner.

The implications of this report are significant, especially in light of current economic realities. Requests for funding are not in favor today, whatever the service or product. Thus, it is important that we specify the uses and benefits of library and information services. These services can, in fact, help us both as individuals and as a society to deal effectively with the broad economic difficulties we face as a Nation. A very modest investment in such services can yield wide-ranging economic benefits.

For example, the individual American pays an average of $5.15 per year to support his or her public library. That is the price of approximately four gallons of gasoline, several loaves of bread, one gallon of cheap paint, or dinner for two at McDonald's. It does not buy even one hardback book, the average cost of which is now more than $20. All of us know what $5.15 can and cannot buy. What does that $5.15 buy at the library?

Among other things, the library user can get information on how to cope with spiralling inflation, how to get a job, how to fix up a home or repair an automobile. One can find help in dealing with income taxes, and maybe save a few dollars there—probably more than $5.15. Most important, a citizen can get information about government: congressional hearings, State legislation, voting records of candidates for public office. Such information enables all citizens to participate effectively in the democratic process.

A second example of the economic benefits that library and information services can provide has to do with transportation/communications trade-offs. The increase in fuel costs has affected not only the decision and actions of individuals, but also those of government. Most of us are aware that airline travel has gone up—42 percent in the last year. More and more Federal agencies are finding it financially impossible to have representatives travel to meetings around the country and are seeking new ways to operate. We have, in fact, reached a point at which we must move information and not people. Many of the new information technologies now make this possible.

The computer and communications industries are probably our only declining-cost industries at this time. To put this in perspective, if the costs of the automobile industry were declining at the same rate as the costs of the computer and communications industries, you would now be able to buy a Mercedes 280 SL for $90.00 and get 1,596 miles to the gallon.

Representatives of the White House have emphasized how important timely and accurate information is to the President and his staff in making decisions. Having accurate information at your fingertips when you need it is important in all areas of government and business. And it is important to each of us in our personal lives. If we look at information and the resolutions flowing from this Conference in this light, we begin to see that information is our new energy resource, with the potential to replace, in many ways, our dependence on fossil fuels and to reduce our dependence on big government. Library and information services can provide the information necessary to keep our country running; they can promote a sense of community; and they can contribute in some very concrete ways to a more stable economy.

The delegates to the White House Conference based their recommendations on these powerful and important concepts. This report contains proposals that can help shape a better future, one in which we would all like to live.

Marilyn Killebrew Gell
April 1980

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction vii

Remarks of President Carter at the White House Conference on Library and Information Services 1

Highlights 7

A National Program: Elements of a Comprehensive National Library and Information Services Program 15

Legislative Outline: The Proposed National Library and Information Services Act 25

Resolutions 37

An Overview of the Conference 85

Proceedings: Transcripts and Speeches

November 15, 1979: Formal Opening 115

- Greetings by Charles Benton 115
- Swearing In of Delegates 116
- Remarks of Marilyn Killebrew Gell 117
- Remarks of Marion Barry, Jr. 118
- Presentation of Awards 121
- Remarks of Richard M. Neustadt 126
- Remarks of Representative William Ford 127
- Remarks of Senator Jacob K. Javits 129

November 15, 1979: General Session I - Adoption of Rules 133

November 16, 1979: General Session II - Five Conference Themes 165

- Personal Needs: Clara S. Jones 166
- Lifelong Learning: Francis Keppel 170
- Organizations and the Professions: Herbert D. Benington 174
- Governing Society: Major R. Owens 178
- International Cooperation and Understanding: Bernard Ostry 183

November 16, 1979: Luncheon Session - Discussion of "Telefutures" Videotape 193

- Remarks of Robert Pfannkuch 193
- Remarks of Nicholas Johnson 195

Page

November 17, 1979: Luncheon Session - Governments and the Information Community 199

Remarks of Bill Clinton 199
Remarks of George Schrader 204

November 18, 1979: Luncheon Session - Citizen Concerns 209

Remarks of Ralph Nader 209

November 18, 1979: General Session III - Presentation of Resolutions 221

November 19, 1979: General Session IV - Adoption of Resolutions 247

Remarks of Daniel Boorstin 248
Proceedings 252

November 19, 1979: Closing Session 313

Remarks of Charles Benton 313

Open Hearings

Open Hearing I 319

Open Hearing II 365

Open Hearing III 405

Written Testimony Submitted 447

Joint Congressional Hearing 663

Participants 671

Delegates and Alternates 675

White House Conference Advisory Committee 691

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science 693

The Committee of the Conference 695

The Information Community Advisory Committee 696

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries 698

Page

White House Conference Staff 699

National Commission Staff 700

Appendices

Conference Rules 703

Resolutions Not Passed 717

Conference Agenda 729

Statistics 737

Conference via Computer, *by Elaine B. Kerr* 767

Conference Publications and Media 807

Remarks of President Carter at the White House Conference on Library and Information Services

November 16, 1979

Chairman Charles Benton, Library Director Juanita Brightwell, and other distinguised leaders who represent one of the finest aspects of American life, I really appreciate the book concerning the duties of a trustee for libraries. In the future I may be looking for my old job back.

So, Juanita, if you can keep it open for me for five years I will really appreciate it.

I am delighted to be here with you this morning. It has been one of the developments in my own Administration to which I have looked forward with great anticipation. I don't have a text. I don't feel that I need one to talk to you.

I had a quick introduction to Washington, to Washington society life, and to newspaper coverage of the first family. The first stories that came out, as a matter of fact, were about Amy's reading habits at the table of an official banquet when the President of Mexico came to see us. She read a book throughout the banquet dinner. When I defended Amy, I had several of my Cabinet members ask for permission to do the same at the next banquet. (Laughter.) As a matter of fact, we have had to put a restraint on that, but since I was a little boy, my own family has had the habit of reading at the table. We have a lively conversation and read simultaneously and Amy is just carrying on one of the Carter family traditions.

I hate to admit this, being an outdoor type and an athletic type, but my family never had to ask me what I wanted for Christmas because they always knew that I would reply, "Books."

When I first went home from the Navy, as Charles pointed out, my first public position was as the trustee of the Sumter County Library Board. I still have my library card. It is No. 5, and I use it whenever I am home.

This morning I would like to talk to you about some of the elements of libraries that are important to a young boy growing up in an isolated community. Students in our public schools, business leaders, and employees of business who are fairly narrowly restricted in their ability to get a continuing formal education, and those who occupy positions of leadership with rapidly varying and challenging responsibilities from day to day—in all those elements of life, libraries and access to books and other information play an important role.

Times change very fast. Information available to the world is exploding more rapidly than it can be accommodated, and the function of libraries is to collect information, to collate information, to assess information, to store information, and to let information be available to those who need it.

There are many people in our modern society who are isolated in some form or another. The deaf, the blind, the immobile, the afflicted, those who live in isolated communities are obvious examples. But there are others. Those who have a particular life career in a fairly narrowly defined area, but who desire constantly to stretch their minds and to stretch their hearts, and to know more about the world around them, other people, opportunities for a more gratifying existence, are in the same category as those who are physically isolated.

Libraries can play this role to make available to people in a special occasion for an unexpected event an opportunity for study. Science, business, politics, government are areas where rapid information is crucial for dealing with challenges of the day, where longtime study to prepare for an event is impossible, because events that are important cannot be predicted. There, the instant access to information and the calm and reasoned guidance of a qualified librarian can make the difference between the success or failure even of a life.

A President, in particular, is faced with various responsibilities, and my access to the Library of Congress, and my access to books is one of the most important elements of my life. Amy reads, sometimes, two or three books a day. She and I have both had rapid reading lessons since I have been President. I read two or three books a week, sometimes more, and in addition to that have instant access to the broad-ranging information which is available here in Washington, and obviously in many other communities in our country.

The Library of Congress was started, as you know, when the Government decided to buy the book collection of President Thomas Jefferson. He withdrew from formal schooling when his life was in the formative stage and began private study—with a tutor, yes, but heavily dependent not on classroom instructions, but on his access to a varied gamut of books. I would guess that one of the most well educated Presidents who has ever served had limited formal schooling, and that was President Harry Truman. His education came primarily from books, history books and others from his local library.

I am not at all criticizing or playing own the importance of formal education, but no matter how broad an educational experience has been in a person's life, sometimes determined by the state of a person's birth or the wealth of a family or opportunities that all can't share—no matter how broad a formal education might be, libraries are still important if that person desires to continue in education throughout one's life.

This need for knowledge about history or current events is particularly important in a democracy, where the strength of a nation depends to a major degree on a well-informed public.

One of the most important responsibilities that I have had on my own shoulders is to make sure that in controversial events the public has a maximum access to knowledge about that event. In the past our country has made some serious mistakes in war, in morality, in the functioning of Government. In the few years before I became President, this was especially true; and in almost every instance, if those circumstances are analyzed, the errors or mistakes were made because the public was excluded from the process of making decisions of our own Government.

An enlightened public, openly debating a controversial issue, sometimes creates confusion. It is much easier to negotiate in utmost secrecy than to let the Congress and the public know the terms of the negotiation and the progress being made. But when the controversial issues can be examined from a broad range of points of view, a nation or a Government or a President is much more likely, ultimately, to avoid mistakes and to make the right decision to preserve our own Nation's security or well-being and also peace throughout the world.

I would like to add just one more comment. We have made good progress in the last number of years in promoting the science of libraries, of information, of communication. Each generation is inclined to think we have gone as far as we can with television, instantaneous transmission of messages and photographs, satellite relay stations, but I would guess that the progress we make in the future, in the next 10 years, the next 100 years, will be just as rapid and just as startling as that we have made in the past.

There must be a flexibility built into a Government's structure, and also in the minds and hearts of American people outside the Government, where most of the responsibility must lie. I am convinced that the new Department of Education will have a greatly expanded and much more effective role in emphasizing the importance of books, of learning, and particularly of libraries. I am determined that this will be the case.

But I believe that this White House Conference and those who attend it, and those who will listen to your voice or whom you can influence when you get home, will have a much more broad-reaching effect than anything a President can do or a Cabinet Secretary or the Federal Government can do.

In a local Lions Club, a local church, a local Rotary Club, a League of Women Voters, Jaycees, in any organization, in a local radio station, television station, newspaper, there are avenues for you to reach a broad range of Americans who don't presently know the advantages of libraries. Many people, because of ignorance or because they have forgotten the joy of learning, don't have access to the opportunities that you can offer.

I hope if you don't do anything else at this Conference, that you will learn from one another how best to present the opportunities of library use and then take that message home and distribute it with the greatest degree of enthusiasm and commitment. When people are reminded, they will respond, and the joys of books and the joys of visual presentations, the joys of movies, slides, paintings, lectures, debates, instruction, music, drama are all parts of a library program, and I hope that you will broaden your own concept of what libraries can do as a result of this Conference.

I am very grateful that you would come to Washington in sometimes a sacrificial way, to participate in learning more about how your own career and your own interest can be made more effective. As we spread the word about libraries and learning and democracy and understanding and communication and progress and harmony and peace through your own work, you can remember that you've got a friend in the White House. Thank you very much.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services convened on November 15, 1979, in Washington, D.C., more than two decades after a library trustee first proposed the idea.

The timing, though delayed, was fortunate. The Conference came at a time when computer and telecommunications technology is fast bringing about profound changes in the ways the American people get and use information. The world will feel the effect of these changes far into the future, but many people only now are beginning to perceive these changes as the harbingers of a new and revolutionary stage of civilization—the Information Age.

As the amount of information expands, and as people's need for it increases, science and technology are developing new and better ways to provide it, ranging from video-cassettes and mini-computers to communications satellites and videodiscs. These developments represent new ways to deliver information to an information-hungry world.

Issues

Questions delegates addressed at the Conference included: Do libraries, the traditional storehouses of information and knowledge have a place in this fast-moving Information Age? If so, what should it be? When should information be private, when should it be without cost, and how should freedom of information principles be applied? Is there a need for a national information policy and, if so, what elements should it include? Can we apply the principles of public access to increase the free flow of information across national borders and through the barriers of conflicting governmental philosophies?

A total of 806 delegates and alternates were among the 3,600 persons from the United States and abroad who participated in the White House Conference. The meeting drew the largest attendance of any White House Conference at one location, underlining the importance of the issues and the widespread interest in keeping ideas and initiatives alive.

Resolutions

Delegates approved a total of 64 resolutions—25 by voice vote and 39 by paper ballot. The resolutions originated in 34 small working groups. Delegates later refined them in sessions centered on the Conference's five basic user-oriented themes: Library and Information Services for 1) Personal Needs, 2) Lifelong Learning; 3) Organizations and the Professions; 4) Governing Society, and 5) International Cooperation and Understanding.

The resolutions call for changes of many kinds but they clearly set some major goals: to reshape library and information services to serve the people in more useful ways, to maintain local control of these services, and to insist on more economy and accountability from the institutions that provide the services.

Resolutions urge libraries to take an increased role
A-4* in literacy training; in improved access to information for
A-5 all, including ethnic minority groups, the blind, the
physically handicapped, and others who are not
adequately served. They favor increased activity by the
E-1 United States to encourage the free flow of information
among nations. Many endorse the idea of the library as
both a total community information center and as an
A-3 independent learning center. Generally, the resolutions
support the concept of the library as essential to a
B-1 civilized society, a concern that Government must view
with high priority in the decision-making process.
Delegates to the Conference also emphasized the
importance of technology and considered ways this
Nation can use it to improve information services to
users. They discussed and refined such concepts as the
B-14,B-16 linking of public telecommunications and the postal
C-12 service with a new, expanded role for libraries.
Participants presented their ideas not only in working
groups but in Congressional and Conference hearings
open to delegates and others who wanted to express
their concerns.

U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island and U.S. Representative William D. Ford of Michigan, both strong supporters of programs to improve library and information services, acted as cochairmen of the Congressional hearing they conducted at the Conference site.

*Notations refer to resolutions recommending proposals made in this report.

History

The idea for a White House Conference was first suggested in 1957 by Channing Bete, Sr., a library trustee from Greenfield, Massachusetts, at a meeting of the American Library Trustee Association, a division of the American Library Association.

As the idea gained acceptance, four presidents supported actions that moved it forward. In 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. In 1970, President Richard M. Nixon signed Public Law 91-345 establishing the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a permanent, independent Federal agency.

On December 31, 1974, President Gerald R. Ford signed Public Law 93-568, authorizing the White House Conference. President Jimmy Carter declared support for the Conference during his presidential campaign and, on May 4, 1977, he signed an appropriations bill which set aside $3.5 million to plan and conduct the Conference under the direction of the National Commission.

The 28-member White House Conference Advisory Committee, appointed by the President and Members of Congress, assisted in planning the Conference. An Information Community Advisory Committee, representing authorities on information services in the Government, the private sector, universities, and research organizations, also contributed ideas to the Conference planning process.

In October 1978, Charles Benton was appointed by President Carter as chairman of the National Commission and the White House Conference. In February 1979, Marilyn Killebrew Gell was named executive director of the White House Conference Staff which coordinated the planning, and organization of the national meeting.

Democratic Process

The planning, operation, and results of the Conference clearly demonstrated the democratic process in action. Delegates represented more than 100,000 people who participated at the State and local level in 58 pre-Conferences, in the States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, among American Indians on or near reservations, and within the Federal library community.

The goal of the Conference was to ensure a free and open forum in which the participants themselves would play the leading role in shaping the structure, concerns and final results.

Congressional hearings on the legislation authorizing the Conference indicated that Congress wanted the meeting to be more than a gathering of professional librarians. As a result, Conference planners at the national level asked the States to select delegates to their meetings so that one-third were librarians and two-thirds were citizens who are consumers of library and information services.

Delegate selection for the national meeting followed the same rule. Thus, delegates to both State and Territory meetings, as well as national Conference delegates, represented a wide cross section of American society. The number of delegates and alternates selected by each pre-Conference resulted from a formula reflecting each State's total representation in the United States Congress. The White House Conference Advisory Committee chose another 105 persons to serve as delegates-at-large, selecting individuals from groups that were under-represented in the list of the State and Territory delegations.

The democratic process of the Conference also was apparent in the drafting of the final rules. By Spring of 1979 many interested people had proposed guidelines for these rules. Some reflected consensus, others indicated conflicting purposes.

A first draft of rules, attempting to represent fairly all points of view, was produced, and appeared in the *Federal Register* on September 13, 1979. In the weeks that followed, comments came from hundreds of persons by letter, telephone, and mailgram, and a second revised draft appeared in the *Federal Register* on October 18, 1979. Final adoption of the rules came after a spirited two-hour debate among the delegates on the opening night of the Conference November 15, 1979.

Planning the Conference

Conference planners also reached out to associations, government agencies, and private groups with an interest in library and information services, in the effort to open the debate to a wide spectrum of issues and organized a series of five theme conferences. These generated ideas to augment the resolutions and recommendations approved by delegates to State and Territory meetings. These theme conferences addressed Federal Funding Alternatives, the Structure and Governance of Library Networks, Libraries and Literacy, International Information Exchange, and New Communication and Information Technology.

The Conference staff, with the help of the American Society for Information Science, also organized two planning meetings and one post-Conference meeting on implementation, bringing together more than 60 leaders of library and information services associations and organizations.

Funding for the State and Territorial Conferences represented a democratic sharing of responsibility between State and Federal Government. Partial funding for the pre-Conferences came from Federal money administered by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The States and Territories contributed 45 to 64 percent of the money to pay for these pre-Conferences according to a formula based upon their populations.

During the Conference planning expertise and support came from many different groups, both within and outside Government—Government organizations such as the Library of Congress, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, the Departments of Commerce and Defense, the Congress, a variety of library and information services associations, private sector publishers, equipment manufacturers, and other business interests. This cooperation between the private sector and various government agencies was clearly evident in the tone and content of the final resolutions of the Conference fusing the grass roots concerns of the delegates with national policy concerns.

Information Center

The Conference Information Center represented an excellent example of cooperation between Government and the private sector in building a model for blending effective traditional library techniques with the leading edge of information technology. The Center was a highly sophisticated combination of advanced technology, providing immediate access to more than 100 data bases, including the computerized catalog of the enormous book and periodical collection of the Library of Congress. It enabled delegates and other participants in the Conference to retrieve information on nearly every conceivable subject, including what was occurring in discussions elsewhere at the meeting.

The Future

The work of the Conference is not finished; it is just beginning. The Conference was a clear demonstration of the power of participatory democracy: a gigantic town meeting where people expressed their views and laid plans to transform the consensus into policy and law. Shaping its results into a new mission for library and information services for the 1980's and beyond calls for the continuing participation and involvement of all concerned. A Committee of the Conference selected by the delegates and composed of ten persons already has met, and another National Committee of delegates from each State is forming to help carry on the Conference's work.

This report includes detailed elements of a Comprehensive National Library and Information Services Program together with an outline for a proposed National Library and Information Services Act. These proposals, and the Conference resolutions, went to the White House in March 1980. The President has appointed an inter-agency task force to study them and make recommendations for action.

The role of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science continues as a mediator and a broker of competing interests, as a catalyst to future activity for making Conference results a reality, and, to provide a forum to coordinate the views of all the constituencies which helped shape the results.

The challenge of using new ways and means to bring information to people is enormous. It may even change the nature of our society. What is certain is that this challenge requires a new course for library and information services through the coming decades to help preserve our democratic values and institutions. The National Commission will continue to help chart this course and stands ready to assist and advise the President and the Congress in serving our country's library and information needs.

Elements of a Comprehensive National Library and Information Services Program

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services reflected the diversity of our citizenry and its needs. The Conference constituted a microcosm of all parts of our society. Delegates made clear that they believed access to information is power, and, that in our democratic society the people themselves want to decide how to use that power.

A-1 A free and open democratic society depends upon the ability of its citizens to make fully informed decisions about the choices that affect their lives and their communities.

Meeting Needs

A-11 People want accurate information to guide them in making intelligent decisions about issues that concern them. They want to know how to find the government services they need to solve their problems. They want information on how to adapt to the rapid changes taking place in their environment. They want to expand their knowledge and range of choices through education.

A-1,A-3 Our citizens regard free and full access to information, especially information about public processes, as a basic right. They believe that library and information services should help to ensure this right.

Our society historically has been a harbor for those who believe that different ethnic, religious, and cultural groups can coexist within one Nation, can enrich our common tradition without infringing on any group's right to full freedom of expression, and can live in harmony without censorship. A-8

In recent years, our citizens have insisted that they want more community control over the government programs that affect them, so that they can exercise more control over the services they support with their taxes. Delegates to the White House Conference demonstrated

A-9 their belief in this principle when they passed a resolution calling for a National Information Policy "which shall include provisions which ensure local control of community libraries and information services."

Rapid Changes

Library and information services are experiencing rapid expansion and change. The pace of change is certain to increase during the coming decade. The information explosion, which really became evident in the 1960's, has accelerated with the fast development of new and cost-effective technologies. Economic uncertainties coupled with changing social conditions have added burdens to library and information services that they cannot bear without Federal assistance. Federal action is necessary to strengthen and assist local and statewide planning, to coordinate present services for maximum effectiveness, and to meet the needs of many sectors of our population for new services and facilities.

Legislation suited to library and information services needs must grow out of the values and principles that are the foundation of these services. The legislation of the 1960's and the 1970's is no longer adequate to meet citizens' needs in the coming decade. Congress already has recognized the importance of statewide planning and of the community base for the provision of effective library and information services.

Three major Federal programs now provide assistance to libraries in the United States: Title II of the Higher Education Act; the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA); and Title IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The services of the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, other Federal libraries, and the U.S. Government Printing Office, also are important to library service and resource sharing throughout the Nation. Federal Government research, publishing programs, communications regulation, and other services affect library and information services in every community.

New Legislation

A National Library and Information Services Act is needed. The Act should result from a review of the current Library Services and Construction Act, the recommendations of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, and other proposals. The Act should establish a new statement of purpose for Federal action in this area and authorize support for new and evolving functions that modern library and information services should perform.

A National Program

A comprehensive National Library and Information Services Program requires a variety of legislative and administrative actions. No single piece of legislation can be the appropriate vehicle for all of these actions. Many other Federal, State and local initiatives are necessary. The following is an outline of those elements that delegates to the White House Conference believe are essential to a Comprehensive National Library and Information Services Program. The ideas that follow represent concerns delegates expressed at the Conference. In most cases the language follows the wording of the Conference resolutions. The notations on the left side of the margin indicate the resolutions that express the ideas.

I. National Leadership Support

B-1	1. Establish the position of an Assistant Secretary for Library and Information Services in the new Department of Education.
F-1,F-2, F-5,F-6	2. Maintain the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as an independent Federal agency.
A-10,B-4 C-14,D-1	3. Strengthen the role of the Library of Congress as a National Library.
F-3	4. Convene a White House Conference on Library and Information Services every decade.

II. National Library and Information Services Resources in the Public and Private Sectors.

A-5	1. Improve access to National Library and Information Services, using national collections, and by strengthening nationwide networks for building and sharing library and information services resources.
C-2	2. Develop a national periodicals system, with funding to establish services and facilities that promote efficient access to periodical and journal resources.
B-6	3. Develop an equitable, reasonable pricing structure for Federal documents, and expand the system of Federal depository libraries to ensure availability of Government information to all people of the Nation.
C-12	4. Develop a national information policy that encourages interconnecting networks, fosters service in all States and Territories, and invites all telecommunication services to provide services to homes, businesses, agencies, and libraries of all types.

D-1 5. Establish a National Library Service for the Hearing-Impaired as a new unit of the Library of Congress, with appropriate additional funding.

D-2 6. Enact National Indian Omnibus Library legislation, that will provide assistance for developing library and information services on all Indian reservations, appropriately tied into State and national networks.

D-3 7. Establish a program to assist the United States Territories in strengthening their information systems to meet their own locally identified needs.

A-12 8. Increase the Nation's access to law library and information services and improve resources for them.

B-10 9. Assure timely and adequate statistical data collection and dissemination to evaluate library and information services.

III. Community Library and Information Services.

A-1,A-5, A-6,A-13 A-4 1. Develop libraries as community cultural, educational, and information institutions, with special efforts from the United States Department of Education to reduce illiteracy, and to encourage development of information and referral services.

A-5,D-1 2. Develop or expand programs for special users such as: children and youth, the aged, the home-bound, the institutionalized (including those in correctional institutions), racial and ethnic minorities, the deaf, the blind, and other physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the mentally retarded, the illiterate, the semi-literate and non-English speaking groups, and other groups not now adequately served.

C-13 3. Encourage cooperation among libraries of all types, and between libraries and other institutions, in meeting community educational and information needs.

A-6 4. Increase awareness of library and information services through public information and instruction in the use of library and information resources.

C-3 5. Support Federal Government programs that encourage improved school and public library cooperative services, and the setting of guidelines for establishing a school library in every school.

IV. Statewide Library and Information Services.

A-4,A-6 B-7,C-2, C-15	1. Strengthen State Library Agency leadership and development.
C-2	2. Support the building and improving of State, multi-State, regional and nationwide networks for improving library and information resource sharing.
C-1,C-9	3. Support the research, development, and application of new technologies for the improvement of library and information services.

V. International Library and Information Services.

C-1,C-14 D-3,E-1	1. Eliminate international barriers to the exchange of library materials and information to encourage international data flow under appropriate guidelines.
C-1,C-14	2. Provide support for the development and adoption of national and international standards.
E-3	3. Convene an international Conference on library and information services.

VI. Education and Training.

A-5,C-15, D-4,E-1	1. Strengthen personnel development and training for library and information services.
C-17	2. Enact a Federal program for a State Library Leadership and Development title that provides matching funds enabling State Library Agencies to pay the costs of hiring traveling specialists for library and information services to adults, young people, and children.
C-18	3. Restore and increase Federal funding for library education research, continuing education, and demonstration projects to prepare graduates to cope with the changing information needs of society.
A-6	4. Train library and information services professionals in human relations, the effective use of public relations techniques, and marketing techniques to increase the public usage of library and information services.
A-13	5. Provide training for library trustees to strengthen the provision of public library services.

VII. Research, development and technological applications affecting library and information services.

B-10 1. Support grants to institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions and organizations for research and demonstration projects to improve library and information services.

C-4 2. Evaluate the economic, social, and political consequences of information and data processing technology so that public, and private efforts can use this technology for the benefit of all.

C-6 3. Encourage cooperation among institutions for the efficient delivery of information technology, especially computer and communications technology, in the exchange, and delivery of information, and develop the necessary software packages to achieve these goals.

VIII. Technical Assistance for Library and Information Services.

B-5 1. Enact legislation restoring tax incentives for authors and artists that encourages the donation to libraries of manuscripts and creative works in all formats.

C-9 2. Recommend manufacturing standards for library and information services resources aimed at preserving materials which have archival value.

B-13 3. Classify independent libraries in the Internal Revenue Code as educational institutions exempt from taxes if they are fully open to the public.

C-12 4. Encourage the increased use of satellite communication, video techniques, and cable television in the expansion of library and information services.

C-1 5. Adopt a policy which would encourage individuals, organizations, and agencies creating documents, books, and other information, to prepare these materials in machine-readable form to reduce retrospective conversion.

C-7 6. Coordinate Federal programs that use and develop technology for information storage and retrieval, and ensure that the public will have access to Federal data bases, and other library and information materials except when personal privacy or national security is jeopardized.

C-9 7. Provide Federal, State, and local funds to continue assessments of individual library needs and to ensure that deterioration of current collections is halted now before unique and valuable library materials are lost.

IX. Funding.

B-3 1. Fund fully the library and information services programs authorized under the Higher Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and, until it is replaced by the proposed National Library and Information Services Act, the Library Services and Construction Act.

B-4 2. Increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and increase participation on the part of libraries in these important programs.

B-14 3. Establish special Federal postal and telecommunications rates which will facilitate the sharing of resources and information between libraries, educational institutions, and non-profit information agencies, especially for remote areas in the United States and Territories.

B-2 X. Enact the Proposed National Library and Information Services Act.

The Proposed National Library and Information Services Act

The following legislative outline brings together those elements, described in the previous section, appropriate for consideration as a single piece of legislation to replace the Library Services and Construction Act which expires in 1982.

Purposes of a New Legislative Act and the Leadership Necessary to Administer It

The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that library and information services are adequate to meet the informational, cultural, educational, and personal development needs of the people of the United States. It addresses cost-effective resource sharing, community library services, linkage of library services to programs of other public agencies, development of library services to meet special user needs, state library agency leadership and development, and programs that assist people in effective lifelong use of library and information resources. The Act builds on accomplishments in library services and or interlibrary cooperation under the Library Services and Construction Act and other library and information services legislation, and assures effective cooperation between State and Federal governments.

Because of the changing character of our library and information services, and other cultural and educational institutions, and because of the increasing overlap of information and cultural programs and interests, an Office of Assistant Secretary for Library and Information Services should be part of the Department of Education. The Office of the Assistant Secretary should serve as a central contact and coordination point for Federal programs affecting public, school, and postsecondary libraries and other information resources and services, as well as archives, museums, historical associations, and public telecommunications. Under the supervision of the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary shall:

A-6 1. Coordinate programs and information concerning these institutions;

B-1 2. Administer programs of formula grants to States and Territories for such institutions;

A-2,B-1 3. Make recommendations about Federal policies affecting such institutions and act as an advocate for the nationwide interests of library, information, and cultural services institutions;

B-10,E-1, E-2 4. Conduct studies to provide information for decisions about such services at national and international levels;

B-3	5. Direct guidelines for research and demonstration projects in this area;
C-18	6. Collect and disseminate information about library and information science education and training.
B-1	7. Initiate cooperative programs with other agencies dealing with library and information services; and
B-10	8. Assure timely and adequate statistical data collection and dissemination to evaluate library and information services.

As an advocate, the Assistant Secretary shall seek to expand and enhance the role of library, information, and cultural services. To contribute to the financial stability of library, information, and cultural services the Assistant Secretary shall work with the appropriate authorities to:

A-4,A-11 A-6,B-8 C-2	1. Stimulate cooperation between different institutions and organizations in working together and sharing resources more effectively to meet citizens' library, information, and cultural needs;
A-4,A-6 C-11	2. Require Federal agencies and recipients of Federal grants to use existing libraries and information services to provide information to citizens;
B-6	3. Maintain subsidies to ensure reasonable Federal publication purchasing costs, and increase the number of available depositories for Federal documents;
A-10,B-4, C-14,D-1	4. Strengthen the Library of Congress in its role as a national library resource;
B-5	5. Change the Federal tax structure to encourage gifts to libraries by authors and artists;
B-8,C-1 C-14,E-1	6. Eliminate international barriers to the exchange of library materials and information to encourage transnational data flow, and provide support for the development and adoption of national and international standards.

The specific provisions of the titles under this act address first, the most effective access to national library and information resources; second, access at the community level; third, access at the State level; fourth, provision of library and information services to Indians on or near reservations; and fifth, education and research needed to support provision of services at all levels.

Title I. Improved Access to Library and Information Resources Through Interlibrary Cooperation and Network Support

Funds appropriated to the States and to the Department of Education (ED) under this title are to be used to: 1) develop and operate interlibrary and inter-institutional systems and networks to improve access to dispersed library and information resources; 2) apply new technologies, from the computer and communication sciences, such as satellite transmission, expanding use of cable, and increasingly sophisticated data bases, for more efficient use and delivery of resources; 3) improve access to advanced research capable of increasing productivity and solving emerging problems.

The purpose of this title is threefold: 1) to provide incentives for sharing information and resources through cooperative arrangements; 2) to reduce disparities among regions; and, 3) make information resources available to more people more economically. Federal actions needed in this area are:

A-4,A-6 1. Approve regulations and requirements for Federal agencies and recipients of Federal grants, to use libraries to provide information, continuing and vocational education, and literacy education for citizens.

A-10,B-4, C-14,D-1 2. Strengthen the Library of Congress in its role as a national library resource;

C-2 3. Create a national periodicals system to achieve more effective access to periodical and journal resources;

E-1 4. Encourage transnational data flow for reducing international barriers to the exchange of library materials and information and support development and adoption of national and international standards;

B-3,B-16 5. Reduce postal and telecommunication rates for the exchange of library and information services.

Federal funds, incentives, and program initiatives in cooperation with the States also are needed to improve community and statewide access to library and information services.

PART A. BASIC GRANTS

States shall receive such sums as may be necessary, with allocations to be made up of a base grant, plus additional funds based on population figures from the latest available census data. Expenditure of funds would be in accordance with a State plan including but not limited to:

C-2 1. Planning, development and maintenance of bibliographic access, communications, and delivery systems on an intrastate, statewide, regional, and national basis, to facilitate sharing of library resources;

A-10,B-11, C-2 2. Financial assistance for collection maintenance and development including the acquisition and development of data bases, in major network resource libraries identified in the State plan, including major urban resource libraries, major academic libraries, and, where appropriate, privately funded library collections which are heavily used as library resources by public libraries in the State;

A-11,C-2 3. Demonstration, establishment, development, and maintenance of interinstitutional information delivery systems on an intrastate, statewide, regional, and national basis.

A-11,C-2 4. Demonstration, establishment, development, and maintenance of intrastate multi-type library systems, where appropriate, including financial assistance for such systems based upon the State network development plan, adopted standards, and formula;

A-10,C-2 5. Participation in multi-State library networks when such participation is the most feasible mechanism for sharing resources and services;

E-1 6. Participation in international library networks when such participation is the most feasible mechanism for sharing resources and services; and

C-8 7. Purchase and use of equipment and software needed to support such activities, including such items as computer terminals, video equipment, rapid copy transmitters, micro-format equipment, etc., to be used in libraries and information services agencies participating in resource sharing. Funds would not be expended for books and other library materials.

A-10 Not less than fifteen percent of the Title I appropriation shall be reserved to the Department of Education (ED) for grants to multi-State networks, consortia, and agencies for programs such as system development, research, operations, and capital costs. A portion of these funds would be used for research and network development, including library based information transfer and electronic home delivery programs, in cooperation with the private sector.

PART B. ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS

States shall use not more than five percent of the funds received under this title for strengthening the capacity of the State's Library Administrative Agency.

Title II. Public Library Services

PART A. BASIC GRANTS

A-6,A-5 Grants shall be made to the States for further development and maintenance of public library systems and services. Grants shall be such sums as may be necessary, with allocations to be made up of a base grant, plus additional funds based on population figures from the latest available census data. Expenditure of funds shall be for the provision, extension and improvement of public library services within a State plan, with distribution taking into consideration the adequacy of public library services in geographical areas, and for groups of persons in the State, including criteria designed to assure equal access to all publicly held information for all citizens, and that priority will be given
B-3,B-9 to programs or projects which serve urban and rural areas with high concentrations of low-income families, and to programs and projects which serve areas with high concentrations of persons who are functionally illiterate and persons of limited English-speaking proficiency.

PART B. COMMUNITY PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

A-6,A-5 Grants shall be made to the States for programs in which library services are linked to the educational, cultural, and informational programs of: public agencies (Social Security Administration, Postal Service, Departments of Labor and Commerce, etc.); public telecommunications; museums; arts groups; literacy programs and services of formal and informal continuing adult education; archives and historical agencies; schools; community colleges; counseling centers; information and referral programs; and other public and private agencies. Grants shall be such sums as may be necessary, with allocations to be made up of a base grant, plus additional funds based on population figures from the latest available census data. State expenditures would be made within a State plan.

A-10,B-10 Not less than fifteen percent of the funds shall be reserved to the Department of Education for direct grants for programs with national or multi-State benefits, including demonstration programs.

PART C. ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS

States shall use not more than five percent of the funds received under this title for strengthening the capacity of the State's library Administrative Agency.

Title III. Statewide Leadership in Development of Public Services

C-17 Grants shall be made to the State to assure State Library agency leadership and innovation in library services to the public based on a State plan. Grants to States under this Title shall be used for:

A-6 1. Administering the State plans submitted and approved under this Act (including obtaining the services of consultants);

A-6 2. Statewide planning for and evaluation of library and information services;

A-6 3. Furnishing statewide library and information services to complement and support community services;

B-3 4. Necessary research and demonstration projects;

A-6 5. Dissemination of information about library and information services to increase public awareness and encourage professional education and training;

A-6 6. The activities of necessary advisory groups and panels to assist the State's library administrative agency in carrying out its functions under this Title;

A-6 7. Strengthening the capacity of State library administrative agencies to meet the needs of the people of the States; and

C-9 8. Preservation of historical records and documents.

A-6 States shall establish State Advisory Councils on Library and Information Services, with members appointed by the Governors, which will include citizen representatives of the indigenous populations of the State. Non-library and information services representatives shall make up at least two-thirds of the membership of the Advisory Council.

PART A. STATE LIBRARY AGENCY LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT

Grants shall be made to the States to strengthen the State Library agency in library and information services development and coordination including consultation and work with academic, public, school, and special libraries, statewide and regional services, planning and evaluation, coordination with regional,
C-2 multi-State and national networks, continuing education
A-13,A-17 and staff development, provision of technical assistance

including that in work with children, young adults, and adults. Expenditure shall be within a State plan. States shall receive such sums as may be necessary, with allocations to be made up of a base grant, plus additional funds based on population figures from the latest available census data.

PART B. SPECIAL USER NEEDS

A-5,D-1, D-4 Grants shall be made to the States for development and maintenance of library and information services and facilities renovations, designed to meet the special needs of such persons as: the blind, deaf, and physically handicapped, persons confined in mental and general hospitals, correctional facilities and other publicly supported institutions; children and adults who are economically, educationally, or otherwise disadvantaged; developmentally disabled persons; and persons whose primary language is other than English. States shall receive such sums as may be necessary, with allocations to be made up of a base grant, plus additional funds based on population figures from the latest available census data. Expenditures shall be made within a State plan.

PART C. LIBRARY AWARENESS AND USER INSTRUCTION

A-6,A-13 Grants shall be made to the States to develop comprehensive programs of public information and instruction in the use of library and information resources. Programs shall be developed in accordance with a State plan. These shall involve all types of libraries, educational institutions, and voluntary groups. States shall receive such sums as may be necessary, with allocations to be made up of a base grant, plus additional funds based on population figures from the latest available census data. Expenditures shall be made within a State plan.

Title IV. Library and Information Services to Indians On or Near Reservations

D-2 Grants shall be made to the U.S. Department of Interior's Center for Information and Library Services to support, develop, and operate library and information services in Indian country*.

---

*Definition of Indian country, 18 United States Code 1151: Except as otherwise provided in section 1154 and 1156 of this title, the term "Indian country," as used in this chapter means:

1. all land within the limits of any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, notwithstanding the issuance of any patent, and including rights-of-way running through the reservation,

2. all dependent Indian communities within the borders of the United States, whether within the original or subsequently acquired Territory thereof, and whether within or without the limits of a State, and

3. all Indian allotments, the Indian tribes to which have not been extinguished, including rights-of-way running through the same.

Title V: Education, Research and Development and National Clearinghouse

C-15,C-16, C-17,C-18, B-10 PART A. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Grants shall be made to institutions of higher education, and library organizations or agencies so that they may prepare and continually educate library and information professionals to serve many diverse user groups through developing such skills as needs assessment, utilization of data bases, and use of other new technologies and relevant techniques.

PART B. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Grants shall be made to, and contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions and organizations for research and demonstration projects related to:

C-4 1. Evaluation of the economic, social and political consequences of information and data processing technologies so that public and private efforts may employ these technologies for the benefit of all;

C-7,C-10 2. Inter-institutional cooperation in the delivery of information;

C-6 3. Application of information technologies, especially computer and communication technologies, in the exchange and delivery of information;

C-1 4. The development of necessary software packages;

C-9 5. The development and application of techniques for preservation of library and information resources;

C-8 6. The development of standards for hardware and software compatibility of computer and communications networks, and machine-readable information, and such other standards as may be necessary.

B-8 PART C. NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE

The department of Education shall establish a national clearinghouse to assist the libraries and information centers of the United States in the sharing and exchange of useful information with similar agencies in other nations.

Resolutions—Table of Contents

Introduction

A. Goals and Objectives

TITLE PAGE

Approved in General Session

A-1 The First Amendment and Public Issues 45
A-2 National Information Policy 46
A-3 National Policy for Free Access 46
A-4 Literacy 46
A-5 Access to Library and Information Services 47
A-6 Public Awareness 49

Approved by Paper Ballot

A-7 Intellectual Freedom and Contemporary Writing 52
A-8 Intellectual Freedom and Censorship 52
A-9 Local Control 53
A-10 Access to Information 53
A-11 Access to Public Agency Information 53
A-12 Basic Legal Information 54
A-13 Public Library Association Mission Statement 54

B. Organization and Finance

Approved in General Session

B-1 Assistant Secretary for Library and Information Services 55
B-2 A National Library Act 55
B-3 Federal Resources for Library and Information Services 56
B-4 Archives and Historical Records 56
B-5 Tax Incentives for Donations of Authors and Artists 57
B-6 Pricing of Basic Federal Government Publications 58
B-7 State and Local Funding for Library and Information Services 58

Approved by Paper Ballot

B-8 National Clearinghouse in Department of Education 59
B-9 Federal Funding Formulas 59
B-10 Training, Research and Development 59
B-11 Preservation and Use of Research Collections 60
B-12 Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation 60
B-13 Tax Exempt Status for Independent Libraries 61
B-14 Postal Rates 61
B-15 Postal Privileges 61
B-16 Delivery of Library Materials 62
B-17 A Federal Relations Network 62

C. Technology, Resource Sharing and Education

Approved in General Session — PAGE
C-1 Technology and Uniform Standards 63
C-2 Networking 64
C-3 School Libraries 65

Approved by Paper Ballot
C-4 Technology for the Promotion of the Common Good 66
C-5 How to Effectively Use Computer Technology 66
C-6 Technology Transfer 66
C-7 Technology and Federal Programs 67
C-8 Technological Standards Research 67
C-9 Preservation of Library and Information Resources/Materials 68
C-10 Interagency Cooperation 68
C-11 Elimination of Duplication 68
C-12 Telecommunication Networks 69
C-13 Interlibrary Cooperation 69
C-14 Cooperative Standards and Networking 69
C-15 Continuing Education for Librarians 70
C-16 Library Skills Instruction 70
C-17 Specialist Staff for State Library Leadership and Development 70
C-18 Training and Continuing Education and Staff Development 71

D. Special Constituent Concerns

Approved in General Session
D-1 Special Constituencies: Library Services to the Disabled and Hearing-impaired 72
D-2 National Indian Omnibus Library Bill 75
D-3 Information Systems in U.S. Territories 77

Approved by Paper Ballot
D-4 Minority Needs 78

E. International Issues

Approved in General Session
E-1 International Information Exchanges 79
E-2 Federal International Communication and Accountability 79

Approved by Paper Ballot
E-3 International Conference 81
E-4 Center for International Studies 81
E-5 Establish an International Youth Library 81
E-6 International Copyright Agreement 82

F. Conference Follow-up and Commendation

Approved in General Session

		PAGE
F-1	Ad Hoc Committee for WHCLIS: Planning and Monitoring	83
F-2	Youth Representation	83
F-3	Future White House Conferences	83
F-4	Commendation of Alphonse F. Trezza	83

Approved by Paper Ballot

F-5	Ad Hoc Group for WHCLIS Implementation	84
F-6	Task Force on National Information Policy	84

Introduction

The 64 resolutions contained in this report represent the principal work and expression of the hundreds of delegates to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. In preparation for this Conference, 58 conferences were organized to ensure all citizens and residents of the United States and Territories an opportunity to express their concerns and to provide their ideas on the agenda and structure of the Conference.

Delegations met in 49 of the 50 States, in the U.S. Territories of American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia. American Indian citizens living on or near reservations and Federal librarians also gathered in separate meetings to define their concerns. Conference planners conducted five topical conferences which dealt with library and information services and funding, resource sharing, literacy, technology, and international information exchange. More than 50 professional societies and associations submitted formal statements and concerned citizens from all walks of life sent hundreds of letters expressing their views on issues the Conference should address.

All of these sources generated approximately 3,000 resolutions and recommendations which provided the basis for the analysis that resulted in the structure of the Conference. The Conference was organized so that each delegate could select and concentrate on policy issues in one of the five major themes: Library and Information Services for: 1) Personal Needs; 2) Lifelong Learning; 3) Organizations and the Professions; 4) Governing Society and 5) International Cooperation and Understanding.

A set of Rules, approved by the delegates, guided the Conference procedures. These Rules organized Conference delegates into 34 different work groups, each with about 20 members. Each work group addressed policy issues in one of the five major theme areas. The work of all groups in a given theme area was consolidated during its theme session. The work groups drafted resolutions, then presented them in each of the theme sessions for discussion and voting. In turn, the priority resolutions from each theme session went before the entire delegate body for consideration in the general sessions.

To expedite the flow of resolutions from the work groups through the theme sessions to the general session, the delegates selected Resolutions Committees. Each theme area had a Resolutions Committee comprised of one member from each work group. The five Resolutions Committees, in turn, selected ten delegates who served as the Conference Resolutions Committee.

The work groups developed hundreds of resolutions. Delegates advanced other resolutions by petition. At the final general session of the Conference, delegates considered the resolutions in two ways. The priority resolutions advanced from the theme sessions were reviewed and voted upon at the general session. All resolutions cleared by petition were introduced at the general session; those receiving a two-thirds vote in favor of consideration were debated and voted by the delegates. Other resolutions advanced from the theme sessions were voted on by paper ballot at the conclusion of the final general session.

Under the Conference Rules and through action taken at the general Conference session, the Resolutions Committee was reconstituted as the "Committee of the Conference" and was authorized to prepare the final report of the Conference resolutions. The committee met in Chicago on January 5, 1980 to review action taken at the Conference and to prepare the final report of the Conference resolutions.

This report includes 64 resolutions. Twenty-five of these were adopted at the final general session of the Conference; 39 were approved by paper ballot. The resolutions are presented under six general topic headings for ease in understanding the total Conference product. In each topic, those resolutions adopted at the general session appear first and those approved under paper ballot, second. The resolutions are not ranked in order of importance. Neither the delegates nor the Resolutions Committee indicated any ranking. Because the paper ballot was prepared before the final Conference session, some items included in the paper ballot had already been acted upon at the general session. The Resolutions Committee has removed any duplicate resolutions and tried to assure that each of the resolutions that follow is unique.

This report presents the major action of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. These 64 resolutions represent an exceptional effort completed within a three-day period by more than 650 delegates who came from all parts of the United States. Although they had never worked together as a delegate body before, the delegates labored in work groups, theme sessions and general sessions to provide this important expression of policy directions for the future of library and information services for this Nation.

The First Amendment and Public Issues

A-1

WHEREAS, a free, democratic society depends on a fully informed citizenry, and

WHEREAS, all persons must be provided information which is objective and reliable, and

WHEREAS, presently available community services designed to provide information to people are often underutilized, and

WHEREAS, public libraries can play a vital role in providing information services both to citizens and to their government officials, and

WHEREAS, all people with day-to-day problems or crises need a readily available source of pertinent information,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services affirms its support for the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America which guarantees freedom of inquiry, freedom to read, freedom to publish, and free and full access to information, especially information about public processes, and that these freedoms are essential to the maintenance of free libraries and informational services, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that libraries should promote and make available information services on public issues for all segments of the community:

1) by acquisition of materials that present various sides of controversial issues;
2) by supporting discussions and forums on issues;
3) by publicizing widely that these opportunities for community discussions are available; and
4) by educating public officials on the availability and use of information resources; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal funding of incentive grants be made available to libraries to serve as information and referral centers in cooperation with other community and educational organizations, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an aggressive public awareness effort be established to promote the utilization of libraries as information and referral centers.

Approved in General Session

National Information Policy

A-2

WHEREAS, a free democratic society depends on a fully informed citizenry, and

WHEREAS, all citizens must be provided information which is objective, timely and reliable, and

WHEREAS, no citizen should be restricted from access to information by the imposition of fees,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a National Information Policy be studied and implemented which would:

1) guarantee all citizens equal and full access to publicly funded library and information services; and
2) ensure that government agencies at all levels work together to make available all new and existing library and information services to the maximum extent possible; and
3) protect the privacy of all segments of our society including personal privacy, economic privacy and national security; and
4) reaffirm the tradition of local control over the selection and purchase of library materials.

National Policy for Free Access

A-3

WHEREAS, information in a free society is a basic right of any individual, essential for all persons, at all age levels and all economic and social levels, and

WHEREAS, publicly supported libraries are institutions of education for democratic living and exist to provide information for all,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services hereby affirms that all persons shouid have free access, without charge or fee to the individual, to information in public and publicly supported libraries, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services advocates the formation of a National Information Policy to ensure the right of access without charge or fee to the individual to all public and publicly supported libraries for all persons.

Literacy

A-4

WHEREAS, there is a serious illiteracy problem in the United States, and

WHEREAS, libraries and information centers can be increasingly important to the solution of this problem,

Approved in General Session

47

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the United States Department of Education implement or expand literacy programs at the community level, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such programs should specifically fund library and information agencies that are capable of implementing these programs, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that States shall:

1) identify the functionally illiterate adult and out-of-school youth population;
2) identify effective education and library adult literacy programs;
3) identify localities not now offering adult literacy programs;
4) coordinate relevant existing education and library programs; and
5) plan and implement adult literacy and out-of-school youth programs in communities where they do not exist, and include materials and space for tutorial programs in libraries; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that under the United States Department of Education, States shall encourage a cooperative effort among public educational agencies, libraries and private nonprofit organizations with functionally illiterate adults and out-of-school youth participating in the planning process and that the funding for such programs shall be the responsibility of State and Federal governments.

Access to Library and Information Services

A-5

WHEREAS, libraries and information services are obligated to reach out to all persons, and

WHEREAS, access to accurate and timely information is essential to personal needs, and

WHEREAS, libraries often do not reach out to persons who require their services, and

WHEREAS, special populations such as children and youth, the aged, home-bound, institutionalized (including correctional institutions), racial and ethnic minorities, those in divergent geographic areas, the deaf, blind, and other physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the mentally retarded, the multiple handicapped, those gifted, illiterate and semi-literate, non-English speaking groups and other groups are not now adequately served, and

WHEREAS, in-service training, training standards for library professionals, job retraining for users and potential users should be made adequate, and

WHEREAS, Federal regulations frequently restrict the right of access to library materials purchased with Federal funds, and

WHEREAS, such restrictions hinder the sharing of resources of various types, and

WHEREAS, current funding is not cost-effective and promotes the overlapping and duplication of services,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that barriers to such services whether legal, fiscal, technical, attitudinal, environmental, cultural, geographic or other, must be eliminated, and that physical facilities and staff must be capable of providing services to all segments of society, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal legislation be enacted to guarantee the right of equal access to all publicly-held information for all citizens, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that institutions educating library and informational services practitioners assume responsibility to address the needs of said consumers through their training and education, and that guidelines by appropriate governmental leaders establish standards of in-service training and that training standards for library professionals be implemented without delay, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a national public policy to promote universal library and information services be adopted, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that access restrictions be removed from library materials purchased with Federal funds, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all learners, regardless of age, residence (including institutions), race, disability, ethnic or cultural background, should have continuing access to the information and material necessary to cope with the increasing complexity of our changing social, economic, and technological environment, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that assistance be provided to establish or sustain libraries and other information centers in the United States and all States that wish to provide service at centers for independent learning bringing such services to those not now served, all with the cooperation of agencies, libraries and centers, and

---

Approved in General Session

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such access programs be funded adequately by Federal, State and local agencies, with public participation, under guidelines established by appropriate governmental legislation, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that library services be extended to include persons in correctional institutions and persons in institutions for the disabled.

Public Awareness

A-6

WHEREAS, libraries, in general, experience a low profile in communities across the United States, and

WHEREAS, the public is not aware of services offered, and more specifically, special constituencies—identified as non-users or underserved—do not enjoy accessibility to libraries due to the lack of information provided them with respect to services available to help meet their needs, and

WHEREAS, involvement of all aspects of the community in evaluating and assessing the needs of the entire community is necessary, but only is possible through increased public awareness of services provided, and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that some citizens lack skills and aptitudes necessary to function and take advantage of services offered, and

WHEREAS, effective awareness programs will provide opportunities for non-users and under-served citizens to assist in needs assessment programs, and

WHEREAS, libraries are viable training grounds that can help to alleviate social misconceptions relative to racism, ethnocentrism and the lack of understanding as it relates to the realities of handicaps, ethnic backgrounds and other situations common to special constituencies, and

WHEREAS, libraries need to recognize that public awareness can:

1) increase the political power of library-related entities;
2) allow all citizens to realize and solve individual, social, and cultural needs;
3) prepare society, in general, to effectively deal with change; and
4) stimulate cultural advancement and inclusiveness,

Approved in General Session

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that in order to accommodate a desired increase in public awareness, the following activities, projects and proposals should be undertaken:

1) development and implementation of an aggressive, comprehensive, nationwide public awareness campaign, coördinated at the Federal level, and involving the following:

    a) a library administration office in the United States Department of Education;

    b) State library agencies;

    c) local library units;

    d) academic and research libraries, special and privately funded libraries, and school libraries;

    e) national, State and local Friends of the Library groups;

    f) the American Library Association and other library-related organizations;

    g) national, State and local organizations representative of all segments of society;

    h) adopting a library symbol for the Nation to be disseminated nationally;

    i) informing the public about existing library and information services which are needed but unavailable;

2) implementation of model or demonstration projects to be administered and developed by libraries in concert with community organizations dealing with effective public awareness programs;

3) the assimilation of libraries into broad-based community projects and programs utilizing the most effective means of creating public awareness of libraries to all segments of the community;

4) establishment of a policy requiring that libraries requesting Federal monies include effective and viable public awareness programs and activities to publicize programs to intended service recipients;

5) training of professionals in human relations, effective use of public relations, and marketing techniques necessary to increase public usage of library services;

6) provision for national, regional, State and local planning consultants and specialists to be made available to local libraries when needed, in order to increase effectiveness of existing and proposed programs;

7) promotion and encouragement of cooperation with volunteer organizations and use of trained volunteers;

8) formation of planning groups reflective of communities—specifically, those segments that are underserved or unserved—to initiate needs assessment and to assist in the development of programs to effectively meet those needs;

9) utilization of all local, State, regional and national agencies, organizations, and groups representative of special constituencies in attaining necessary support, political power and, simultaneously, providing an instrument for further assessment and increasing awareness, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the funds allocated to each State for the administration of library programs be increased by a fixed percentage to be allocated to a professional public information program using multimedia to be jointly sponsored by State library associations and State library agencies and that the State library agencies will administer the funds, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in order to adequately plan these programs, there should be a statewide planning committee appointed by the governor with two-thirds lay members and one-third librarians and trustees, coordinated at the national level through a public relations arm of the Office of Library and Information Services under an Assistant Secretary of Education and national professional organizations should be involved.

Approved in General Session

Intellectual Freedom and Contemporary Writing

A-7

WHEREAS, any request for information should not be judged, and any individual has a right to read what he or she wishes, and this right is not an attempt to impose his or her standard on others, and

WHEREAS, a lack of information is keeping much contemporary writing out of the public reach, thereby interferring with the traditional library function of preserving and transferring the culture,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that all libraries and information agencies and appropriate boards should adopt policies that support the concept of intellectual freedom as embodied in the Constitution of the United States, Library Bill of Rights and the Freedom to Read Statement, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the local, State and Federal governments should support efforts by individuals, groups, or governments to ensure the freedom of choice of every individual, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that library education and training include the acquisition of the works of small and independent publishers, whose works are often outside the visible bibliographic network, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal incentive be provided to bring about programs on a grassroots level that would bring writers and other creative artists of local, regional, and national prominence into the library for workshops and other public presentations, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a policy be adopted by the designated national library agency which shall assure access by children and students to information and library services, including access to information on social and personal issues of importance to those age groups.

Intellectual Freedom and Censorship

A-8

WHEREAS, democratic principles and pluralism require that every American has the right to be exposed to a diversity of ideas and gain various perspectives on life,

WHEREAS, acts of censorship and infringements upon the first amendment and intellectual freedom rights of all of our citizens are major obstacles to freedom of access to information, and

WHEREAS, such acts of censorship still occur in the United States, denying rights to full freedom of expression not only to adults but, of equal importance, to youth.

Approved by Paper Ballot

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services affirms the Right to Read Statement and Library Bill of Rights of the American Library Association, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pre-service and in-service programs be established which focus on the training of librarians to promote intellectual freedom.

Local Control

A-9

WHEREAS, there should be a National Information Policy,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that such a National Information Policy shall include provisions which ensure local control of community libraries and information services.

Access to Information

A-10

WHEREAS, individuals, organizations and professions should have convenient access to the periodical literature of the entire world,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the system should fully utilize existing national and international library strengths, that the financial viability of the document delivery system of net-lending libraries must be protected, and that mechanisms should be developed to ensure that financial incentives for publishing are preserved, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that responsibility for developing and implementing this policy should include the coordinated efforts of the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, and the Library of Congress.

Access to Public Agency Information

A-11

WHEREAS, the Government produces a large amount of information at taxpayers' expense and makes it available in a passive manner, and

WHEREAS, people do not know how or are unable to take advantage of government information, and

WHEREAS, currently Government agencies, utilizing public funds are required to collect, disseminate, or provide information to citizens, and

WHEREAS, resources are wasted in duplication and time lost due to the difficulty in locating pertinent information, contributing to decline in citizen participation in government and wasting government resources at a time when they are scarce, and

Approved by Paper Ballot

54

WHEREAS, through better coordination, more cooperation (pooling of information), and aggressive dissemination, these problems can be addressed, and we foresee the library, with its technical and professional expertise, playing a central (supportive) role,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that at every level of government — local, State, and Federal — where agencies agree to pool information, there be enabling legislation permitting funds for mandated information services/functions to be pooled so that information on a certain subject or of a given type can be located in a publicly acknowledged public location, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Federal Government provide incentive grants to match cooperative pooling efforts to enable libraries and information services to provide services in coordinating and processing information, and require that upon receipt of Federal funds aggressive outreach be done by libraries in the community to stimulate use, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all pooled information shall be readily available to the public except for limitations imposed by legal protections for national security, privacy and proprietary rights.

Basic Legal Information

A-12

WHEREAS, there is a need for a national policy to ensure equal access to necessary basic legal information for all people,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services support the adoption of this policy, which shall include:

1) the establishment of programs designated to improve basic legal resource materials in public libraries;
2) continuing library education programs which include the development of basic legal reference skills; and
3) most importantly, guaranteeing access to publicly supported law collections within their locality.

Public Library Association Mission Statement

A-13

WHEREAS, there is a need to support the Public Library Association Mission Statement on users' needs and continuing education,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference endorse the Public Library Mission Statement of the Public Library Association with relation to its new emphasis on the library responsibility to meet the users' needs, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Boards of Trustees, advisory boards and community persons, as well as practicing librarians, be provided continuing education that is responsive to changing community needs.

Approved by Paper Ballot

Assistant Secretary for Library and Information Services

B-1

WHEREAS, libraries are a vital element in the process of lifelong learning and education, and

WHEREAS, a national focus and a national priority for libraries as centers for information, education and lifelong learning are needed to provide national coordination for all types of libraries, and

WHEREAS, the new United States Department of Education has not provided for or recognized the need for a separate and distinct administrative office within this department,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that an Office of Library and Information Services be established within the United States Department of Education directed by an Assistant Secretary of Education, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Assistant Secretary shall administer all grants and programs currently administered by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources and shall establish communications with all Federal programs related to library and information services, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a representative from the White House Conference on Library and Information Services testify on this resolution before the Congressional hearing on Monday, November 19, 1979.

A National Library Act

B-2

WHEREAS, present legislation has not proved adequate to meet the changing library and information needs of our citizens,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services endorses and supports the enactment of a national library act incorporating the general principles, goals, and objectives of S.1124 with such modifications as shall appear desirable after full public hearings before appropriate congressional committees, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Congress be requested to hold regional hearings to consider such matters as: the definition of a library; categorical funding for rural, sparsely populated, or impacted areas; a proposed funding formula; and the structure and representation of a national committee or a national advisory board, including the matter of lay and library related persons and special constituencies.

Approved in General Session

Federal Resources for Library and Information Services

B-3

WHEREAS, adequate funding levels for existing Federal authorizations are essential, and

WHEREAS, a reordering of Federal priorities is needed to provide for library and information service needs, and

WHEREAS, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services delegates were advised personally by the President that libraries "have a friend in the White House,"

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the President propose and Congress approve:

1) that for FY 1981, and subsequent years, there be full funding of the Library Services and Construction Act, appropriate titles of the Higher Education Act and Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the National Library of Medicine program, and that this resolution be transmitted immediately to the President and to the Office of Management and Budget;

2) new Federal funding which would authorize:

   a) innovative demonstration projects such as: research and community needs assessment projects, cultural awareness projects, age-level consultant projects, and youth incentive projects;

   b) elementary and secondary school libraries and certified staff library instruction and media programs; and

   c) new funding for academic libraries; and

3) Federal funding formulas which would include:

   a) special support for rural, urban and economically deprived areas;

   b) criteria of population, geography, local participation, need and ability to pay; and

   c) requirements of State and local responsibility;

4) federal postal and telecommunication rates for delivery and return of library, information and educational materials to non-contiguous or isolated areas be reduced; and

5) designation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title IV-B as categorical aid for school libraries.

Archives and Historical Records

B-4

WHEREAS, information on past actions and decisions of government at all levels is essential to understanding the past and planning for the future, and

---

Approved in General Session

WHEREAS, only a portion of this information is contained in printed materials deposited in libraries, the major sources being the archives and historical manuscript collections preserved in the National Archives, Library of Congress, State and Territorial archives, and historical agencies and libraries throughout the Nation, and

WHEREAS, funding is needed to identify, collect, describe, preserve and make this material available to the public, and

WHEREAS, the contributions and support of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities to the preservation of the Nation's historical and cultural heritage are hereby recognized and endorsed,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Congress is requested to renew the authorization for funding the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and to increase the funding for this Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities so that their essential contributions toward preserving and making accessible the historical records of the Nation can be continued and expanded.

Tax Incentives for Donations of Authors and Artists

B-5

WHEREAS, prior to the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (PL 91-172), an author or artist who donated his or her literary, musical or artistic compositions or papers to a library or museum could take a tax deduction equal to the fair market value of the items at the time of the contribution, and

WHEREAS, since 1969 such deductions have been limited to the cost of the materials used to produce the compositions, and donations to libraries have been severely reduced, and

WHEREAS, an entire generation of literary papers may be lost to future scholars through lack of an incentive to donate them to libraries, and

WHEREAS, restoration of a tax incentive would contribute to the equitable tax treatment of authors and artists and would increase public access to and preservation of the Nation's literary and artistic legacy,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the United States Congress enact legislation restoring a tax incentive for authors and artists to donate their creative works to libraries and museums.

Approved in General Session

Pricing of Basic Federal Government Publications

B-6

WHEREAS, broad public participation in government is essential to the effective functioning of a democracy, and

WHEREAS, the Nation's libraries provide students, scholars, and the general public with free and equal access to the printed record of the Federal Government, and

WHEREAS, fewer than eight percent of the 18,000 public libraries, branches, and college libraries in the United States are eligible to receive one copy of the *Congressional Record, Federal Register,* and other basic publications free through the depository library program, and

WHEREAS, House Report 96-245 urges that the Public Printer raise the price of these and other subsidized publications to fully recover costs, and

WHEREAS, this action would limit the number of libraries able to afford these publications, thus lessening public access to those fundamental tools of democracy,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the United States Congress continue to foster broad public participation in the Federal Government by substantial subsidies on the sale of basic Federal documents and continue to maintain a system of regional and local depositories for Government information.

State and Local Funding for Library and Information Services

B-7

WHEREAS, current Federal trends are putting greater fiscal responsibility for libraries and information services on local and State funding agencies,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that local and State priorities be reordered to respond to that increasing need for excellence and wide use of library and information services and that this reordering must result in improved funding for all types of nonprofit library and information services with significantly heavier shares borne by the States and the Federal Government.

Approved in General Session

National Clearinghouse in Department of Education

B-8

BE IT RESOLVED, that there be organized within the United States Department of Education a National Clearinghouse to assist the libraries and information centers of the United States in the sharing and exchange of useful information with similar agencies of other nations.

Federal Funding Formulas

B-9

WHEREAS, Federal grants are currently being awarded primarily on a per capita basis and in addition many have matching grant requirements, and

WHEREAS, areas, such as the non-contiguous areas of the United States and rural areas, which have low population density and low per capita income are penalized by the existing policy, yet they have the greatest need for information resources, and in order that all citizens will have access to the information they need,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a national library act should include special provisions for funding those areas with special needs.

Training, Research and Development

B-10

WHEREAS, there exists a present and future need for research and development in library and information services and in the education of librarians and information specialists, and

WHEREAS, the effective planning and implementation of new directions in access to library and information services to support lifelong learning will require an improved understanding of present and future needs, user characteristics and behavior, and delivery methods,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a high priority be assigned to an expanded national and local research, development and demonstration program in relation to resources and services sharing, user patterns, evaluation, networking, standardization of bibliographic formats, improved delivery capability, and experimentation with delivery technology, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a research arm and a Clearinghouse for Library and Information Services be established within the United States Department of Education for this purpose, and

Approved by Paper Ballot

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that as a part of the research and development program, Federal funds be provided to support professional library education programs in providing entering and practicing librarians and information specialists with training in new areas which are projected as a function of library information services with special attention to assessing present and future training needs in the areas of community outreach programming, community literacy programming, non-print resources services, the information sciences, services to the handicapped, adult education, institutional services, public relations, research competencies, services to special cultural groups, and resource management.

Preservation and Use of Research Collections

B-11

WHEREAS, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services recognizes the need to implement an aggressive program for the physical preservation and effective use of the rare and valuable collections of our Nation's research libraries,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that State and Federal funds should be made available to those libraries and repositories which are identified as having key research, rare and valuable collections of national importance, and which make substantive efforts on their own initiative to preserve their materials and to provide access by the American people to their collections, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such funds should be used: to provide proper environmental conditions for preservation; to augment research and evaluation of de-acidification processes so that the library community can have confidence in an effective method of preservation; to establish training programs to develop qualified restorers; and to augment microfilming of material which cannot be saved and storing of master negatives under optimum conditions.

Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation

B-12

WHEREAS, the present Administration has proposed an Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation (ISTC) to:

1) strengthen capacities of developing countries seeking to apply science and technology to meet their needs, and
2) focus increased scientific and technological research attention on the search for better ways to meet basic human needs and approach global problems, and

WHEREAS, one of the ten major program areas of the proposed ISTC is "communications and information systems," and

Approved by Paper Ballot

WHEREAS, these tasks are consistent with the White House Conference theme "increasing international understanding and cooperation," and

WHEREAS, the ISTC has been authorized by the Congress, but there has been controversy over its funding and appropriation,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services endorses the ISTC and urges the Congress to follow up its authorization with the appropriations needed to make the ISTC operational.

Tax Exempt Status for Independent Libraries

B-13

BE IT RESOLVED, that independent libraries which are supported by private foundations whose only responsibility is the support of such libraries, if those libraries are fully open to the public, should be classified in the Internal Revenue Code as educational institutions, thus exempting them from Federal income taxes.

Postal Rates

B-14

WHEREAS, there are geographical barriers to access to information which should be eliminated and which particularly affect the non-contiguous areas of the United States, and

WHEREAS, the delivery of library books and materials and audio-visual materials by surface mail causes a serious delay in delivery, often resulting in the receipt of information when it is no longer of use, and

WHEREAS, domestic telecommunication rates do not apply to non-contiguous areas of the United States,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the policy of the United States Postal Service should be changed so that all library materials addressed to non-contiguous areas will be sent as airmail at surface mail rates, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal policy regarding telecommunication rates should be revised to ensure that domestic rates apply to non-contiguous areas of the United States.

Postal Privileges

B-15

BE IT RESOLVED, that free United States franking privileges be extended to cover mailing library information to citizens and to other libraries for the purposes of encouraging free dissemination of information and inter-library resource sharing.

Approved by Paper Ballot

Delivery of Library Materials

B-16

WHEREAS, geographical barriers and deficient postal delivery impede access to information by organizations and the professions and are particularly significant to the non-contiguous parts of the United States and its Territories and to the visually impaired, and

WHEREAS, domestic telecommunications rates do not apply to non-contiguous parts of the United States and its Territories,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the United States Postal Service change appropriate policies and regulations so that all library materials addressed to and from non-contiguous parts of the United States and its Territories will be sent as airmail at surface mail rates, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal Communications Commission policy regarding telecommunications rates concerning library services should be revised to ensure that domestic rates apply to non-contiguous parts of the United States and its Territories, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the United States Postal Service handle library materials addressed to or coming from the visually impaired as first class mail.

A Federal Relations Network

B-17

WHEREAS, libraries need to recognize that awareness can increase the political power of library-related entities,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a Federal relations network on library and information services be established, comprised of library advocates representing each State and Territory of the United States, including representation from special constituencies to monitor and lobby for Federal legislation affecting library and information services and to act as a catalyst for the establishment of regional, State, and local affiliate organizations.

Approved by Paper Ballot

Technology and Uniform Standards

C-1

WHEREAS, recent advances in computer technology for the creation and reproduction of documents can provide substantial reduction in cost, and

WHEREAS, many emerging technologies are now available in the public domain and could be instrumental in supplementing the flow of and access to information, and

WHEREAS, development and use of technical and procedural standards can improve effectiveness and reduce cost and extend the use of library and information services, and

WHEREAS, effective standards facilitate the exchange of information between public and private sectors and that this exchange of information is needed to better support organizational, professional, and personal activities, and

WHEREAS, economical media conversion capabilities are very important,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that individuals, organizations, and agencies creating documents and books and generating other information be encouraged to create these materials in machine-readable form in order to decrease the load of retrospective conversion, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Federal Government direct all federally supported libraries and information services and other appropriate Federal agencies to support the development, review, and adoption of national and international standards for publishing, producing, organizing, storing, and transmitting information, using established and recognized procedures and institutions, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that high priority be given to establishing or extending standards which address hardware and software compatibility, computer and communications network protocols, and machine-readable information, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the private sector be encouraged to participate and to support the development of such standards, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that research be funded to develop new technologies that permit convenient and economical media conversion from and to appropriate media.

Approved in General Session

Networking

C-2

WHEREAS, library and information services contribute significantly to information resources, and

WHEREAS, access to information and library resources available in all types of libraries is needed and must be equally available to all citizens, and

WHEREAS, all types of library and information centers have resources which can contribute to library and information services, networks, and programs at all geographic levels, and

WHEREAS, resource sharing is now mandated by the information explosion, the advance of modern technology, the rapidly escalating costs of needed resources, and the wide disparity between resources available to individuals by reason of geographic location or socio-economic position,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a comprehensive approach be taken to the planning and development of multi-type library and information networks, including both profit and not-for-profit libraries from the public and private sector, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such plans be developed at the national, regional, and local level to include specific plans for a national periodicals system and the concept of a national lending library for print and nonprint materials, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that plans be developed for the coordination of library and information networks and programs which would identify the responsibility for such coordination in the United States Department of Education's Office of Library and Learning Resources (or its successor) and the State library agencies, and such other agencies, organizations, or libraries as are involved in such networks, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that control of such networks remain at the State or regional level, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that mechanisms be developed to ensure access by all individuals to such networks and programs, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal and State funds be made available to continue to support and interconnect existing networks, as well as to develop new networks, and that such funds be designated for network operations and for grants in support of local cooperative action, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all agencies and institutions that provide education and continuing education for library practitioners should offer training in the skills, knowledge, and abilities which will help ensure that practitioners are competent to provide access through these networks in a most effective manner.

Approved in General Session

School Libraries

C-3

WHEREAS, children must have access to print and nonprint learning materials, and

WHEREAS, cooperative planning must be encouraged between school and public libraries, and

WHEREAS, comprehensive programs for instruction must include coordination of library services, hours of service expanded beyond school class hours, and the readily available services of qualified library professionals, and

WHEREAS, students must not be confronted by physical and administrative barriers to access, and

WHEREAS, preschool programs, supplemented by parent-education programs, should be provided,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that school and public library boards and administrators should establish policies for cooperation, and for instructional programs for children in the usage of the library, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that school library and public library staff should specify procedures and implement programs for cooperation in accord with community and school needs and for instructional programs for children in the usage of the library, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Congress shall set guidelines for the establishment of a school library in each school and that States will implement these guidelines and set standards for libraries in all schools and evaluate local efforts and that local school districts will plan and implement appropriate programs for their communities which fit within the Federal and State guidelines, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that library services for small schools be provided through cooperative arrangements contracted among school districts or through regional service centers to ensure certified teacher librarians and adequate resources, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Federal Government be urged to fund at fully authorized levels those legislative programs which support improved school and public library services.

Approved in General Session

Technology for the Promotion of the Common Good

C-4

WHEREAS, organizations and professions have been and are continuing to be largely responsible for the development of technology for the storage, communication, and manipulation of information, and

WHEREAS, we have a continuing interest both professionally and as citizens in ensuring that these rapidly developing technologies promote the common good,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Federal Government initiate continuing studies directed at evaluating economic, social, and political consequences of information and data processing technology so that public and private efforts may be made to direct these technologies to the benefit of all.

How to Effectively Use Computer Technology

C-5

WHEREAS, there is a lack of information and coordination about, and between, professions and organizations that provide services for human development such as youth, elderly, and special user groups, and

WHEREAS, libraries can facilitate cooperation between these professions and organizations and foster dissemination of such information,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that libraries offer material and services to these organizations and professions that serve these groups and provide a clearinghouse for information and referral.

Technology Transfer

C-6

WHEREAS, many emerging technologies, such as communications, printing and publishing methodologies, transmittal, storage and archival technologies, among others, are now available in the public domain and could be instrumental in supplementing the flow and access of information,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Federal Government address itself to transferring and applying those technologies to the storage and dissemination of information by libraries and information centers of all varieties with the goal of guaranteed minimum basic technological access for every individual, organization, or profession.

Approved by Paper Ballot

Technology and Federal Programs

C-7

WHEREAS, national standards for library and information services must be developed in consultation with the national library community in order that technology compatible in hardware, language, and format can be developed to allow networks to interact effectively, and

WHEREAS, existing incompatible networks must be encouraged to develop the technology that would provide access to their multiple data bases,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Federal programs for development and utilization of technology for information storage and retrieval be coordinated. The public should have access to Federal data bases except when personal privacy or national security are in jeopardy. The library and information industry professionals should assume the responsibility for coordination of the Federal and public interest in information technology, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the increased application of technological advances should be balanced with an increased awareness of the necessity to humanize such efforts. All plans for future services should review those services both from the technological and the human effect point of view. Information in existing national centers or national data bases, not subject to restricted access, should be made available to all libraries on an equal and mutually beneficial basis. The application of existing or future technology should be considered in planning library services to implement effective methods for obtaining information in order to eliminate inequities caused by inadequate resources, geographic and architectural barriers, and economic deprivation.

Technological Standards Research

C-8

WHEREAS, telecommunications and computer technologies are currently in place and facilitating network services in many libraries, and

WHEREAS, such services would be greatly enhanced through the development of technological standards that would assure cost-effective library systems, and

WHEREAS, such standards would provide the ability to form larger networks, thereby providing national access to information by any library and information center, and

WHEREAS, only some libraries have been able to avail themselves of such technology,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the private and the public sectors join in furthering research directed toward the development of technological standards, and

Approved by Paper Ballot

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funds be sought which would assure every library of at least one computer terminal connected to an appropriate number of data bases.

Preservation of Library and Information Resources/Materials

C-9

WHEREAS, library and information resources are continuing and will continue to deteriorate unless measures are taken to deter that deterioration,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that efforts be made on the Federal, State, and local levels to promote and advance the conservation and preservation of library and information resources/materials, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the appropriate Federal, State, local, and private agencies address the following issues:

1) the adoption of standards (humidity and temperature controls) for the storage of library and information resources/materials;
2) the support of research on the environmental effects on library and information resources/materials;
3) the adoption of manufacturing standards for those resources/materials deemed to be of long-term value and for those considered to be of archival value; and
4) the provision of Federal, State, and local funds to survey library and information service facilities and upgrade those not providing adequate conditions for the preservation of materials and resources.

Interagency Cooperation

C-10

WHEREAS, rules and regulations covering various federally funded programs sometimes discourage interagency cooperation and prohibit access to library and information resources,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that all future Federal rules and regulations encourage interagency cooperation and access to federally purchased library and information resources.

Elimination of Duplication

C-11

BE IT RESOLVED, that the President should issue an executive order amending the A-95 clearinghouse review process to require that application for Federal grants be reviewed to reduce duplication of information services, and

Approved by Paper Ballot

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that incentives should be provided to encourage applicants for Federal and State funding programs to demonstrate that they will not duplicate an information program already serving the target group, and that preference should be given to libraries as information service providers where such preference would not duplicate existing programs.

Telecommunication Networks

C-12

WHEREAS, we seek to maintain diversity and autonomy of libraries and their collections, and to provide a suitable communications system which will facilitate equal access to information for all citizens and eliminate the inequities created by physical barriers of time and distance, and to encourage a diversity of facilities and services,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that our national information policy encourage:

1) interconnecting all networks, fostering service in all States and Territories, and inviting the cooperation of all telecommunication industries to provide distributed access broadband common carrier service to homes, businesses, agencies, and all libraries;

2) the integration of broadcast, conference, and private communications and document delivery of audio, data, and image transmissions; and

3) provision of lower rates for libraries and educational services.

Interlibrary Cooperation

C-13

WHEREAS, formal and systematic channels must be developed to provide cooperation among all library and information services in order to improve access to all information for all citizens,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Congress, the United States Department of Education, and State legislatures should examine legislation to ensure cooperation, and that Congress and State legislatures should provide incentives through appropriations for cooperation, particularly by increasing funding for the Library Services and Construction Act, Title III (Interlibrary Cooperation).

Cooperative Standards and Networking

C-14

WHEREAS, better procedures should be developed for gathering and processing information on an international scale, and

WHEREAS, the application of technology and participation in cooperative projects requires the development of and adherence to mutually acceptable standards,

Approved by Paper Ballot

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that uniform standards for national bibliographic records universally adopted be implemented, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Library of Congress be charged and funded to promote national acceptance and use of uniform standards for the development of international networks, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Federal Government in concert with other Government or international agencies support the adoption of technological mechanisms and the establishment of professional services, including programs to overcome language barriers.

Continuing Education for Librarians

C-15

WHEREAS, technological developments demand additional training for those imparting library skills, and

WHEREAS, the use of library materials and services depends on the knowledge and expertise of library professionals,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that funds be made available for the retraining and updating of those imparting library skills, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the continuing education of librarians be coordinated through library schools, library associations, and State agencies.

Library Skills Instruction

C-16

WHEREAS, every child should have access to a library, and

WHEREAS, a reasonable amount of time for instruction in library and information services needs to be established in the curricula of the Nation's schools at all levels,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that library skills instruction curricula should be developed and implemented in elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and other educational programs.

Specialist Staff for State Library Leadership and Development

C-17

WHEREAS, libraries serve people of all ages, and

WHEREAS, the 1980's will require maximum use of resources, programs that anticipate user needs, adaptive, innovative, and individualized services, and cooperation with community and government programs, and

WHEREAS, librarians, trustees, and community leaders will benefit from program assistance designed to help them meet the needs of all people, and

Approved by Paper Ballot

WHEREAS, each State library agency staff needs traveling specialists in adult services, services to young adults, and services to children,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services urges each State to provide specialists in adult, young adult, and children's services to assist libraries in developing needed service programs, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the White House Conference urges Congress to enact a State Library Leadership and Development title which provides matching funds enabling States to provide these positions and the program funds needed for improving services at the community level.

Training and Continuing Education/Staff Development

C-18

WHEREAS, particular attention should be devoted to preparing and continually educating library and information professionals to serve many diverse user groups through developing skills in needs assessment, utilization of data bases, and other new technologies and relevant techniques,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that there should be immediate restoration and increased Federal funding for library education, research, continuing education, and demonstration projects in order to:

1) recruit minorities and students with a specialized background that are under-represented in the library and information science profession;
2) upgrade facilities, curricula, and faculty competencies to prepare graduates to cope with the changing information needs of society; and
3) provide continuing education for current librarians.

Approved by Paper Ballot

Special Constituencies: Library Services to the Disabled and Hearing-impaired

D-1

Preamble

It should be understood and accepted that special constituencies, including disabled and hearing-impaired persons, do not have the same needs; nor do these constituencies solve these needs in the same manner. The issues addressed herein outline specific needs of various disabled communities and hearing-impaired communities.

Two specific resolutions, attempting to identify needs and address various methods for meeting such needs, have been synthesized to express a concerted and concerned voice addressing pertinent issues in two parts:

A.) Access-related issues
B.) Special information needs of hearing-impaired persons

Section A: Access-Related Issues

WHEREAS, more than 34 million disabled and hearing-impaired Americans are significantly unrepresented in public and private training, and in the delivery systems of library and information services, and

WHEREAS, library and information services programs are often housed in buildings containing numerous environmental barriers, and

WHEREAS, for the most part, neither public and private libraries, nor school and college library programs, adequately provide library and information services for persons with developmental, hearing, learning, mental, physical, and visual disabilities and mental handicaps, and

WHEREAS, Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act (PL 93-112) mandates physical, programmatic, attitudinal, and communication access, and

WHEREAS, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) mandates that all children receive an equal education in the most integrated setting appropriate,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

A. Access to Library Positions, Boards, Library Programs and Library Training Programs:

   1) Steps shall be taken to assure that instructors in library and information services training programs, as well as students participating in such programs, reflect the participation of disabled persons.

   2) Library training and continuing education programs shall be provided for library personnel to increase awareness of special needs of disabled persons.

   3) Steps shall be taken to assure that the public and private complex of local, regional, and State school

and college library programs include on their boards and staffs participation by disabled and hearing-impaired persons and, further, that communication and support services be provided.

B. Access to Library and Information Services Programs and Facilities:

1) Steps shall be taken to encourage more disabled persons to utilize library and information services; and special efforts shall be made to provide services through video and audio tapes, captioned films and sign or foreign language films for non-English speaking persons or users of American sign language.

2) That immediate steps shall be taken to ensure that all libraries covered by Section 504 complete transition and self-evaluation plans, that Federal funds be available to implement said plans, and that these same libraries commit themselves to strict adherence to said plans, including the required modifications for program and environmental access.

3) Many other libraries shall be encouraged to review, with assistance from disabled persons and groups, methods by which their facilities can be made environmentally and programmatically accessible.

4) Special communications devices (which shall include but not be limited to teletypes for hearing-impaired library users, reading machines, and computer terminals with braille and speech output for non-print readers) be provided wherever possible.

5) Special studies shall be initiated to determine the feasibility of providing, on a long-term loan basis, equipment for the translation of print and audio sources into forms of data which disabled individuals can easily employ. Such a loan program should be modeled after the existing machine lending program of the Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

C. Access to materials:

1) The Library of Congress shall coordinate programs and multi-sensory services (print books used in conjunction with cassettes and recorded books, and captioned films) tailored to the needs of the developmentally disabled and persons with learning disabilities. This shall be done with the participation and consultation of disabled consumers and directors of special education and vocational rehabilitation programs.

2) Publishers shall be encouraged to develop materials relating to training in independent living for mentally restored persons, in alliance with library and information services programs which shall be

Approved in General Session

developed with the assistance of prospective service recipients.

3) Information on the incidence, prevalence, characteristics, treatment, and latest research findings on "handicapping conditions" shall be provided to the public through special statewide networks.

4) Creation of video tapes and other media aides specifically designed for the hearing-impaired shall be produced with the participation of hearing-impaired persons, and distributed on a national level.

D. Access for Persons in Institutional or Correctional Facilities:

The foregoing recommendations shall be adapted to meet the needs of disabled persons located in institutional or correctional settings.

Section B: Special Information Needs Of Hearing-Impaired Persons

WHEREAS, hearing impairment is the single most prevalent disability in the United States and is a communications barrier that has led to misunderstanding and ignorance of deaf persons' needs by the general public, and

WHEREAS, deafness affects people of every age, race, ethnic origin, and educational background, and

WHEREAS, deafness draws people together in a unique language which has its own context and meaning, serving as a native language to many, with English as a second language,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that libraries meet the needs of the deaf in the following manners:

A. State Level

1) train personnel in library service to the deaf.

2) establish a Library Committee for the Deaf under the auspices of the State Library Commission, which will include deaf individuals.

3) establish a clearinghouse that will act as a sole information and referral source in the State to assist all libraries to serve the deaf and the general public on information needs about deafness and services for the deaf for interlibrary loan.

B. National Level

enact a National Library Service for the Deaf under the auspices of the Library of Congress. The service shall be developed and devised by a board consisting of deaf professionals, deaf consumers, library professionals, and lay persons.

Approved in General Session

National Indian Omnibus Library Bill
D-2

WHEREAS, there is at the present time no funding in any agency dedicated to the development or operation of library systems in Indian country*, and

WHEREAS, such funds as have been used in the past are unreliable, inadequate, and usually project-oriented, and

WHEREAS, library, cultural, and information resources at a compensatory level are now urgently needed by American Indian/Alaska Native people living on or near reservations, and

WHEREAS, the Federal agencies are increasingly aware that Federal trust responsibility relating to education mandates inclusion of library/information resources, and

WHEREAS, the States of Arizona, Illinois, New Mexico, Michigan, Montana, Washington, and Wisconsin, have called for the White House Conference to support specific Indian library legislation,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Congress be asked to enact a National Indian Omnibus Library Bill to include:

1) a title on training, both pre-service and in-service, to be determined by tribes, Alaska Natives, and Aleuts in collaboration with higher education agencies that leads to certification for Indian library workers, and that tribes and their designated Indian organizations and institutions shall be included in such programs. Particular emphasis would be on continuing education and career development, on-the-job experience, and work study;
2) a title on historical and contemporary materials and dissemination of information in all formats;

---

* DEFINITION OF INDIAN COUNTRY, 18 United States Code 1151: Except as otherwise provided in sections 1154 and 1156 of this title, the term "Indian country," as used in this chapter, means:

a) all land within the limits of any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, notwithstanding the issuance of any patent, and including rights-of-way running through the reservation,

b) all dependent Indian communities within the borders of the United States, whether within the original or subsequently acquired Territory thereof, and whether within or without the limits of a State, and

c) all Indian allotments, the Indian titles to which have not been extinguished, including rights-of-way running through the same.

Approved in General Session

3) a title on construction or remodeling of library/information/cultural resource facilities;

4) a title on technical assistance to be provided to new or developing libraries;

5) a title on the support of library/information services to Indian studies programs in institutions of higher education;

6) a title providing financial support to Indian communities, both urban and rural, as a means of conducting information needs surveys in building a base for library development;

7) special purpose program grants and contracts; and

8) a title establishing a National Indian Library Center that would do the following:

    a) implement the BIA Plan for library/media/information services development as continuously modified, monitored, and reevaluated by the tribal governments operating under it;

    b) serve as a stimulus and focal point for the preservation, production, collection, and distribution of materials of interest to Indian libraries;

    c) operate as a clearinghouse and referral center for materials (including oral history and language materials);

    d) provide technical assistance through a bank of Indian resource people who can provide intensive, short-term help;

    e) facilitate a national network capability;

    f) establish links between the National Indian Library Center and high school and college counselors regarding Indian students and library career training opportunities; and

    g) encourage a horizontal approach to information access funding within BIA, so that health, social services, economic development, job training and other programs carry their own information services support components.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Indian Omnibus Library Bill should be administered by the United States Department of the Interior's Center for Information and Library Services in line with policies established by tribal governing boards.

Approved in General Session

Information Systems in U.S. Territories

D-3

WHEREAS, the people of the United States Territories have identified the need to have increased access to information and to be served by trained personnel, and

WHEREAS, the United States has the responsibility to assist these United States Territories to strengthen their information systems to meet their own identified needs,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the United States assist United States Territories in the establishment of bibliographic control mechanisms to ensure the availability of and accessibility to their government documents, literary production, technical, economic, social documentation, etc., and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the United States provide financial and technical assistance to help develop the necessary information infrastructures to facilitate their participation in national, regional, and international networking, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services recommend to the President of the United States that there be focus on the United States Territories to accelerate the better utilization of their present resources, and that avenues be sought to build new information resources as needed.

Approved in General Session

Minority Needs

D-4

WHEREAS, the Nation's people are rich in cultural and ethnic diversity,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that library collections and personnel training shall include a special emphasis on the indigenous ethnic populations of the local community they serve, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that collections and staff training be developed with the participation and assistance of representatives from the indigenous ethnic population of the local community, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that categorical grants be made available to school, public, and academic libraries to accomplish these goals.

Approved by Paper Ballot

International Information Exchanges

E-1

WHEREAS, there is a need to start and expand dialogue among members of the international community for the sharing of all forms of information, and

WHEREAS, for humanitarian purposes, the sharing between nations of all unclassified information should be encouraged, and

WHEREAS, there is a need to encourage dissemination of information of all kinds, and to encourage cooperation in the exchange of information and personnel among all countries, and

WHEREAS, the library and information community has an important role to play in achieving effective exchange of information,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a new Federal program be enacted and funded which would provide for an exchange and training program for library and information service personnel, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that protocol for library and information exchange in the United States support the participation in the Universal Availability of Publications and encourage the elimination of trade and other barriers to the exchange of library materials and information of all kinds, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that as Federal and State programs for networking are established, consideration for international communication and sharing be included within the framework of the networks which are created, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal funds should be made available for the implementation of international networking.

Federal International Communication and Accountability

E-2

WHEREAS, many departments and agencies of the United States Government are involved in the international exchange of information, and

WHEREAS, there is no central coordination of activities, resulting in the possible duplication of effort, waste, and gaps of coverage, and

WHEREAS, the United States should examine its role in the new information society and should formulate policies that are prospective rather than reactive,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the President:

1) make a report on governmental agencies engaged in these activities and attendant costs;

Approved in General Session

80

2) make recommendations to eliminate duplication of effort and waste, and to expand coverage where appropriate, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that on the basis of this report the President formulate necessary procedures to coordinate United States participation in international communication and information programs, both public and private.

Approved in General Session

International Conference

E-3

WHEREAS, recognizing that the unimpeded flow of information and published materials is essential to the promotion of international peace and security, and

WHEREAS, the need for an international standard for exchange programs in the fields of science, technology, and other cultural matters among nations and international corporations is acknowledged, and

WHEREAS, noting that the UNESCO, the United Nations University, and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations are interested in the enhancement of all cultures, the promotion of civil rights, and the status of women in all nations,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services recommend to the President of the United States that an International Conference on Library and Information Services be held.

Center For International Studies

E-4

WHEREAS, there is a need in the United States for knowledge of foreign languages and cultures, and

WHEREAS, the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies has reported in October, 1979, and recommended ways to address this need,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the delegates to the White House Conference support the concept of regional and national centers to further international understanding, as recommended by the Commission.

Establish an International Youth Library

E-5

WHEREAS, the encouragement of appreciation of other cultures should start at an early age, and there exist few comprehensive international collections of children's literature in the United States, and

WHEREAS, a collection of this kind would be of great value to scholars in the field of children's service and could serve as a coordinating point and demonstration of such services,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a center, similar to the International Youth Library in Munich, be established in the United States, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that through this center, libraries throughout the country be encouraged to emphasize children's programming which recognizes the positive values of cultural differences and which promotes international understanding.

Approved by Paper Ballot

International Copyright Agreement

E-6

WHEREAS, the United States is a member of the Universal Copyright Convention, and

WHEREAS, the new United States Copyright Act allows the United States to move toward appropriate international copyright arrangements,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the United States should continue to seek improved international copyright accords.

Approved by Paper Ballot

Ad Hoc Committee for WHCLIS: Planning and Monitoring

F-1

BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science convene an Ad Hoc Committee composed of delegates elected by each delegation to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services to be responsible for planning and monitoring Conference follow-up activities.

Youth Representation

F-2

BE IT RESOLVED, that there be at least one youth appointee named to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a voting member, that States be encouraged to include youths on their library boards as voting members, and that local governments be encouraged to include at least one youth as a voting member on the local library board.

Future White House Conferences

F-3

BE IT RESOLVED, that a White House or a Federal Conference on Library and Information Services be held every decade to establish the national information goals and priorities for the next decade, to assure effective transfer of knowledge to citizenry, and to accomplish this goal in light of accelerated changes in information technology and practices.

Commendation of Alphonse F. Trezza

F-4

WHEREAS, Alphonse F. Trezza, as director of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, has demonstrated dynamic leadership in many of the areas of concern to this White House Conference on Library and Information Services, and has initiated many of the plans and activities which have culminated in this Conference,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the delegates to this Conference, acknowledge and congratulate Mr. Trezza for his contributions to this Conference, to the National Commission, and to the development of libraries and information services throughout the United States.

Approved in General Session

Ad Hoc Group for WHCLIS Implementation

F-5

WHEREAS, it is necessary that the resolutions of this Conference be carried to the appropriate agencies and bodies,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a delegation should be established, consisting of one lay and one professional member from each State, Territorial, or special delegation to the Conference, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science shall assist the ad hoc group selected by the members of this delegation from its number to plan, implement, and follow up resolutions from this Conference.

Task Force on National Information Policy

F-6

WHEREAS, while we support the concept of a national library and information act to establish national information policy, and

WHEREAS, Study Bill S. 1124 does not adequately address the special information needs of professions and organizations,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a task force on the special information needs of professions and organizations shall be convened promptly by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to correct these deficiencies, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the task force shall address a report and recommendation to be given to the legislators and staff persons framing a National Library Act, and shall include participation of providers and users of information services appropriate to organizations and professions.

Approved by Paper Ballot

The White House
Conference on Library and
Information Services, 1979

An Overview of the Conference

Table of Contents

TITLE PAGE

- Origins of the Conference: 1957-1977 89
- State Meetings and Delegate Selection: 1977-1979 91
- The Conference: November 15-19, 1979 94
  - The Structure of the Conference 94
    - Themes 94
    - Work Sessions 96
    - Rules 97
    - Facilitators 98
    - Resolutions Process 99
  - An Overview of the Proceedings 101
- Outreach 104
- Innovations 106
  - Planning 106
  - Process 106
  - Documentation 107
- Applications of New Technology and Service Approaches 108
  - Computer Conferencing 108
  - The Information Center 110
    - Information-on-Demand 110
    - Conference Communications 111
    - Message Center 111
    - State Resolutions Area 111
    - Blind and Physically Handicapped Media 112

Origins of the Conference: 1957-1977

The Conference opened as the Nation moved with increasing speed into an era that many students and observers of long-term social, political, and economic trends now call the "Information Age." As the 1970's ended, social scientists estimated that more than 50 percent of the Nation's gross national product came from activities related to the production, exchange, and use of information.

The extent of today's information activities was hardly forseeable in 1957 when Channing Bete, Sr., a library trustee from Greenfield, Massachusetts, first suggested the idea of a White House Conference at a meeting of the American Library Trustee Association. Active support by the American Library Association, other concerned individuals and special groups kept Mr. Bete's idea alive. Meanwhile, in response to the recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, which was appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1966, Congress enacted in 1970 a bill, P.L. 91-345, establishing the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), as a permanent, independent agency.

The establishment of NCLIS accomplished two things. First, NCLIS endorsed the concept of holding a White House Conference on Library and Information Services, adding momentum to the idea. Second, the existence of a permanent Federal agency, concerned solely with libraries and information science, provided a locus of responsibility for planning and conducting the Conference itself, and for spearheading the implementation of the recommendations coming out of the Conference.

President Johnson and his three successors, Presidents Richard M. Nixon, Gerald R. Ford and Jimmy Carter, all supported the concept of a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

PL 93-568, which became law in 1974, authorized and requested the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services not later than 1978 "to develop recommendations for the further improvement of the Nation's libraries and information centers and their use by the public." The Justice Department ruled that so long as the President issued the call for the national meeting by 1978, the Conference itself legally could occur later.

The law said that the Conference should set goals consistent with the following seven statements:

- *Access to information and ideas is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government.*

- *The preservation and the dissemination of information and ideas are the primary purpose and function of libraries and information centers.*

- *The growth and augmentation of the Nation's libraries and information centers are essential if all Americans are to have reasonable access to adequate services of libraries and information centers.*

- *New achievements in technology offer a potential for enabling libraries and information centers to serve the public more fully, expeditiously, and economically.*

- *Maximum realization of the potential inherent in the use of advanced technology by libraries and information centers requires cooperation through planning for, and coordination of, the services of libraries and information centers.*

- *The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is developing plans for meeting national needs for library and information services, and for coordinating activities to meet those needs.*

- *Productive recommendations for expanding access to libraries and information centers will require public understanding and support as well as that of public and private libraries and information centers.*

On May 4, 1977, President Carter signed the Fiscal Year 1977 Supplemental Appropriations Bill which set aside $3.5 million for NCLIS to plan and conduct the Conference. Just before leaving office in January 1977, President Ford, in keeping with PL 93-568 had named 15 persons to the official White House Conference Advisory Committee. The law provided for the appointment of 13 additional persons to the committee: five each by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives and three by the NCLIS Chairman. The eventual 28-member committee represented a wide range of geographical regions and professional expertise. In September 1977, NCLIS hired a small planning staff to assist the States and Territories in planning pre-White House Conferences and defining the issues for the national Conference.

Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, chairman of NCLIS from 1970 until he retired in May 1978, oversaw the early planning for the Conference. Alphonse F. Trezza, executive director of NCLIS, directly supervised the planning from 1977 to January 1979.

State Meetings and Delegate Selection: 1977-1979

In September 1978, Charles Benton was appointed chairman of NCLIS and assumed responsibility for Conference planning. On February 1, 1979, Marilyn Killibrew Gell was named executive director of the White House Conference staff.

Under guidelines developed by the staff and approved by NCLIS, 58 pre-Conferences were held to *ensure* all U.S. citizens and residents an opportunity to express their concerns and to provide ideas on the agenda and structure of the Conference. These conferences were convened in 49 of the 50 states; in the U.S. Territories of American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territories, The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands; and the District of Columbia. Additional conferences were held for American Indians living on or near reservations and for Federal librarians from Federal libraries. Georgia conducted the first in September 1977. By April 1979, 49 states (all except South Dakota), six United States Territories, the District of Columbia, and American Indians living on or near reservations, had met for pre-Conferences to define the issues, vote on resolutions and elect delegates to the national Conference. The Indian Conference, meeting in Denver in October 1978, was the result of a special request to the Advisory Committee by the National Indian Education Association to conduct a conference to address the special library and information needs of Indians. At the request of the Federal Library Committee, an additional pre-Conference, called the Federal Libraries and Information Services Pre-White House Conference, convened in July 1979. This Federal library community, which had not participated in the earlier planning process for the White House Conference, elected two delegates and two alternates to the national Conference and also produced numerous resolutions and recommendations.

Partial funding for the pre-Conferences came from Federal money administered by NCLIS. The States and Territories contributed the remaining 45 to 64 percent according to a formula based upon their populations. The number of delegates and alternates selected by each pre-Conference for the national Conference was determined by each State's total representation in the United States Congress.

PL 93-568 did not specifically require selection of delegates to the pre-Conferences and to the national Conference with a ratio of one-third library and information services professionals to two-thirds lay persons or community representatives. Rather, the law said the Conference should bring together:

- *representatives of local, statewide, regional, and national institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations which provide library and information services to the public;*
- *representatives of educational institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations (including professional and scholarly associations for the advancement of education and research);*
- *persons with special knowledge of, and special competence in, technology as it may be used for the improvement of library and information services; and*

- *representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people, and other members of the general public.*

Congressional hearings on the Conference legislation made it clear that Congress did not want the White House Conference to be strictly a gathering of professionals. Therefore, one of the fourteen planning memoranda that NCLIS sent to the States spelled out the one-third, two-thirds rule. Conference planners followed this rule in selecting delegates to the national Conference as well as the State and Territory meetings.

Delegates to the pre-Conferences passed approximately 3,000 resolutions and recommendations and elected 568 delegates and 238 alternates to the White House Conference. The White House Conference Advisory Committee chose an additional 105 delegates-at-large. Because the delegates were diverse in background and represented a cross section of American society, bringing together many users and potential users of library and information services, the White House Conference provided a true demonstration of participatory democracy. Sociodemographic statistics on the delegates are provided in the appendices to this report.

Delegate preparation for the Conference had two chief goals. The first was to ensure that the delegates were able to address effectively the issues that concerned them and the people they represented. The second was to assist them to translate these concerns into realistic and specific recommendations to the President and the Congress.

The preparation process involved a variety of elements ranging from efforts to give the delegates access to information on the issues to helping them with lodging and transportation.

The State and Territory meetings that began in Fall of 1977 provided practical parliamentary experience for many of the people who later became delegates to the Conference. More than 80 percent of the delegates to the national Conference participated in State, Territory or other pre-Conference meetings. Participants learned how to define issues, negotiate their differences and reach consensus. They began a continuing dialogue with librarians and other information providers and the consumers who use library and information services, discussing the respective needs of the major groups. Many of them increased their awareness of the issues that concerned citizens living in their areas.

The regional and special meetings produced more than 3,000 resolutions. A special publication was prepared summarizing these resolutions and incorporating the analysis prepared by King Research *(Issues and Resolutions; A Summary of Pre-Conference Activities).* Issued to the delegates prior to the Conference, the summary permitted delegates to examine similarities and differences on key issues throughout the Nation.

In the final weeks before the Conference, memoranda and special information concerning logistics and agenda were issued to all delegates and alternates. In addition, each delegate was personally contacted by telephone to ensure that all arrangements were in order and that the special needs of individuals were met.

Two series of publications provided information on the key issues, *Discussion Guides* and *Theme Conference Summaries*. The *Discussion Guides* summarized key issues in each of the Conference theme areas. The *Theme Conference Summaries* provided overviews of five special pre-Conferences on critical issues.

In addition, a series of *Context Papers* was prepared. The *Context Papers* included reprints from journals and scholarly articles, and provided delegates with a broad overview of the state of information services in the Information Age. A six-part audiotape series was produced and disseminated. Entitled *Dialogs on the Future of Library and Information Services*, the tapes captured varying points of view on key issues as expressed by leading spokespersons. The production of the tapes was made possible through a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

A complete list of publications and media prepared for the Conference is included in the appendices to this report

The ranks of the 911 delegates and alternates were swelled by approximately 2,600 other participants, making this White House Conference, with a total of 3,500 participants, the largest in attendance at one single site of any White House Conference in history. The other participants included public and private sector representatives, prominent private citizens, dignitaries from abroad, and representatives of the media.

The large attendance and widespread interest that the Conference generated resulted, in part, from concerted efforts to strengthen the base of support for the Conference and from a national public awareness campaign.

The Conference staff, with the cooperation of associations, universities, government agencies and private organizations, organized a series of meetings and five theme conferences to generate additional ideas and issues to augment the resolutions and recommendations approved by the pre-Conferences.

The theme conferences dealt with Federal Funding Alternatives, the Structure and Governance of Library Networks, Libraries and Literacy, International Information Exchange, and New Communication and Information Technology.

The Conference staff, in conjunction with the American Society for Information Science (ASIS), also organized two planning meetings bringing together more than 60 leaders of library and information services associations and organizations. The staff also organized a 25-member Information Community Advisory Committee. This committee, representing a wide range of information interests, met three times before the Conference and provided valuable insights and support from the private sector.

The purpose of these meetings was to encourage the free expression of ideas from a broad spectrum of librarians and users of library and information services on the issues and objectives of the White House Conference.

The Conference: November 15-19, 1979

The Structure of the Conference

Based on a consensus from pre-Conference activities, the Conference planners concluded that the White House Conference should be structured primarily in terms of user needs. The resolutions passed by the States and Territories revealed a variety of groups with important stakes in the issues of library and information services. These included libraries—public, school, academic, research, Federal, State, special; information service organizations—clearinghouses, publishers, broadcasters, database producers; the government—Federal, State, and local; educational institutions; the private sector—business and industry, unions, foundations; and the general public.

Individually authored discussion guides were prepared to assist delegates in examining the five themes of the Conference and user needs. These are summarized here.

Themes

Library and Information Services to Meet Personal Needs:

- *Should library and information providers offer new services to meet personal needs?*
- *What national policy issues must be addressed if libraries and information services are to effectively meet personal needs?*
- *How should library and information services be expanded or redesigned to meet the needs of special constituencies?*
- *What legislative and funding initiatives are required to foster effective use of limited resources in our Nation's libraries?*
- *What measures will encourage maximum use of the Nation's information resources?*

Library and Information Services for Enhancing Lifelong Learning.

- *How could the present Federal legislative program supporting libraries and information services (school, public and academic) be more effectively administered?*
- *What are the respective roles and areas of cooperation between school and public libraries in meeting the needs of school-age children?*
- *How best can a national network be implemented to support the Nation's educational goals?*
- *How can libraries and information services improve and enhance the lifelong learning opportunities of the Nation's citizens?*
- *How can libraries and information services best be used to promote literacy?*

- *Should there be a greater percentage of State support in the total funding of public libraries and what are the dimensions of the Federal role?*
- *Should those academic and research libraries with collections of regional and national significance be accorded a special status by the Federal Government?*
- *How can local community, public school and academic libraries and information services that support our national educational programs adapt to the changing social and technological environment?*

Library and Information Services for Improving Organizations and the Professions.

- *What new roles and services should libraries and other information providers assume in serving organizations and professions?*
- *What kinds of information delivery services should be used to meet the needs of organizations and professions?*
- *How can libraries and information providers best serve the needs of special constituencies such as professional groups and non-profit organizations?*
- *What should be the roles of the Federal Government and the private sector in providing information services and systems that serve organizations and professions?*
- *To what extent should information be made available to individual and organizational users?*

Library and Information Services for Effectively Governing Society.

- *How best can we distribute information needed for governing society?*
- *Should government share its legislative information system developed by the Congressional Research Service?*
- *What new services can libraries offer?*
- *What are the issues in freedom of information?*
- *How do we ensure the preservation of information sources necessary for governing society?*
- *Do we need a national information policy?*

Library and Information Services for Increasing International Cooperation.

- *In a pluralistic world, do Americans need more information from abroad? Do other peoples need new types of U.S. information? If so, how can these needs be met?*
- *How can comprehensive and well-articulated policies and procedures for sharing U.S. information best be developed?*
- *As technology advances, how can the goal of broader information flow be balanced with the rights of private corporations and nation states to control the information they generate?*
- *Why should the underlying international imbalance and the ability to create and disseminate information be reduced?*
- *How can the United States help the developing countries meet their information and communication needs?*

The above description of the thematic structure and the major issues raised under that structure were the basis for the organization of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. However, the actual content of the Conference—and, therefore, its results—were determined primarily by the delegates themselves in their various sessions.

Work Sessions

The Conference process was designed to funnel resolutions from broad-based small working groups to final action on the part of the entire voting body, after priority-setting in theme sessions.

Delegates were assigned to one of 34 small working groups according to their choice of theme area. Any delegate who had not indicated a theme area was numerically assigned to a working group.

The process of the small working groups was very important to the conduct of the Conference. The Conference plan was designed so that most of the resolutions would be formulated in these sessions. Any combination or refinement of these initial resolutions would be at the theme area level. Given that there could be overlap in interests and/or concerns among the five theme areas, the process provided for a general Resolutions Committee of elected delegates who were empowered to make those combinations, accommodations, and/or other alterations that would permit composite resolutions to be voted on by all of the delegates.

The constituent groups for the Conference had a very important role in the scheduling of the activities of the Conference. Specific requests were made by delegates and others during the Conference planning to increase the amount of scheduled time for the adoption of the rules for the Conference, for the small group working sessions, for the theme sessions, and for the general voting sessions. Arbitration among all of the requests allowed for the adoption of the rules of the Conference by late evening of the opening day. The final schedule allowed nine hours for small group work sessions, six hours for theme sessions, and six hours for general voting sessions.

The feeling of many professional and lay delegates was that maximum time should be allowed for the delegates to deliberate and vote on the final resolutions. These feelings were reflected in the final schedule.

Rules

By May 1979, many suggestions concerning both the process and the rules for the Conference had accumulated. Some of the suggestions reflected consensus; others indicated conflicting purposes. In June 1979, a first draft of the proposed rules was submitted to the Advisory Committee and to the National Commission for review. These rules took into account the suggestions that had been received. Following the review, the first draft of the proposed rules was published in the *Federal Register,* on September 13, 1979. During the time period for public comments, hundreds of letters, telephone calls, and mailgrams were received.

Aspects of the Conference that the communications addressed concerned the definition of roles of participants; rules on replacement of delegates; voting procedures (including a suggestion of a paper ballot procedure); seating of delegates and alternates; rights of alternates or others to speak in working group, theme, or general sessions; deadlines for suggestions of new business; quorums; executive sessions; and credentials of delegates. The major area of concern was the process for forming resolutions. The consensus was that the resolutions process should be controlled by the delegates.

For this reason, the revised rules that appeared in the *Federal Register* of October 18, 1979, proposed a Resolutions Committee composed solely of delegates.

Another item of concern was the chairmanship of the working sessions. After considering all of the suggestions from diverse interest groups, it was determined that only those who could not vote or did not have authority to speak in the context of the Conference could, as disinterested parties, chair any of the meetings.

The roles of moderators of the theme sessions and moderators of the general voting sessions were also considered to be of such importance that only individuals uniquely qualified to deal with the formal political processes of voting could be considered for these roles. For this reason, a Federal judge and other individuals who had demonstrated capabilities to lead such voting meetings were selected for the roles of moderators. Other individuals were trained to assume the roles of facilitators in the small working group sessions.

A final area of concern on the part of delegates was that both the librarians and non-librarians among them should have vital roles in the final wording of the Conference Resolutions as well as in the operation of the Conference. The final draft of the proposed rules, distributed to the delegates on November 15, 1979, defined the specific roles of all the participants. These rules stipulated that delegates or alternates should not be small group facilitators or moderators of theme or general sessions. They also stipulated that alternate delegates should not sit with delegates in their voting sessions, nor have an unchallenged voice in the Conference proceedings. The revised rules also put the conduct of the resolutions process solely in the hands of elected delegates. The rules provided for the election of delegates from each of the small working group sessions to a resolutions committee for each of the themes. These theme resolutions committees would resolve any conflict or overlap in the resolutions from the small working groups and would present revised resolutions to the delegates in their respective theme areas.

The rules also provided for a general Resolutions Committee consisting of two delegates from each of the theme resolutions committees. This general Resolutions Committee was charged to consider all of the theme resolutions, and to formulate those resolutions that were not voted as top priority by the theme areas into a "paper ballot," which would be voted on by the entire body of delegates. The revised rules also provided for the general Resolutions Committee to be the Committee of the Conference and to "take steps to provide for the accurate reporting of the proceedings and the recommendations of the Conference, as well as take responsibility for any procedures relating to future convening of another White House Conference on Library and Information Services." The revised rules also streamlined the process by which a certified voting delegate could be replaced by a certified alternate.

The revised rules were adopted by the delegates with one amendment: each theme area was allowed as many priority resolutions as there were small working groups in that area; since there were 34 small working groups, the total number of priority resolutions that could be brought to the final general session for voting was 34.

The text of the rules is included in the appendices of this report.

Facilitators

The decision to have facilitators, rather than chairpersons, at the working group level was a major decision in the functioning and conduct of the Conference, and reflected the overriding philosophy that the delegates were the key leaders in the process at all levels. In response to requests for proposals for the training of the facilitators, two proposals were received. After careful study of both, the A.K. Rice Institute was selected. The training program was carried out in a two-and-one-half-day workshop immediately prior to the White House Conference. This program used group dynamics techniques developed at the Center for Applied Social Research of the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations in London. Forty-one individuals from all parts of the United States volunteered to participate in this training program. These individuals paid their own travel costs and expenses for their stay both during the training and at the Conference.

The success of the training program for the facilitators was demonstrated early in the Conference when they met to develop procedures to carry out their assigned functions. The group developed a personal definition of their role, within the framework of the Conference rules. Their definition read as follows, "Those who have agreed to be facilitators recognize that their role is to manage the discussion, decisionmaking, and elective processes in the small workshops and to work with the recorder in processing the resolutions work sheets. It is not part of the facilitator's function to act as a resource person or as a delegate with decisionmaking powers."

Resolutions Process

The critical work of creating the Conference resolutions was carried out according to the procedures established in the rules. This process is summarized here. The role of the Conference Resolutions Committee in this process should be noted. There were two types of resolutions committees: theme resolutions committees and a general Resolutions Committee.

Each small workgroup elected a committee member who served on the theme resolutions committee for that theme. These committees served to synthesize resolutions in each theme area. The general Resolutions Committee was composed of two elected delegates for each theme area chosen from the theme resolutions committees. The function of this committee was to present the resolutions from the theme areas to the general voting body.

During the first sessions each small workgroup elected a delegate to represent that group on the resolutions committee. The delegates met on the first evening of the Conference and again after their second round of workgroup sessions with the theme moderators for their respective themes. During the second meeting the delegates exchanged information as to the expected products of their small workgroups, in order to note any similarities or differences in focus among their groups. Because each of the theme resolutions committees operated in a unique manner, this process will be described for each theme session.

The Theme I resolutions committee, dealing with *Meeting Personal Needs,* decided on four topics on which there seemed to be consensus among the workgroups. They presented all resolutions in these categories to the entire theme delegation, to get consensus on the concepts embodied in the resolutions. Following this, they synthesized the resolutions for voting at the second theme session. The resolutions voted as priority were then forwarded to the general Resolutions Committee for discussion and voting at the first general session.

The theme resolutions committee for Theme II, *Enhancing Lifelong Learning,* met both between and after the small workgroup sessions and combined similar resolutions or resolutions dealing with similar topics into single resolutions. These resolutions were presented to the delegates in Theme II, along with the original wording of the small group resolutions. Theme II operated in a manner slightly different from the other theme groups, in that no debate or amendment to the resolutions proposed was allowed until all of the resolutions had been voted either up or down.

The resolutions committee for Theme III, *Improving the Organizations and Professions,* established an initial process for its theme session deliberations by which it provided a list of the resolutions, which the committee had arranged or merged into a single list grouped by topic. Each small group delegate representative was then asked to present the resolution from his or her group as a motion.

In Theme III, it was the theme delegate body that voted the authorization for combining groups of resolutions in single topic areas. In Theme III, there was also a different process for establishing the top priority recommendations; two ballots were used in order to set the four top priority resolutions from that theme. The first ballot provided space for the delegates to list their four priority resolutions; the second ballot permitted the delegates to rank order all of the additional resolutions.

In Theme IV, *Governing Society,* members of the resolutions committee combined and ranked all of the small group resolutions prior to the first theme session for that theme. They also compared the results of their small group sessions with those of other theme resolutions committees, and came up with a rank ordering of priority resolutions taken from the top five priority resolutions of the small workgroups in that theme. During the second theme session, the resolutions were voted on. The committee also suggested that the remaining resolutions that they had not ranked be voted on by the theme session before the rank ordering of the priority resolutions took place. After consideration of the resolutions that had been combined by the resolutions committee, any other resolutions that came up from the small workgroups could then be considered.

In Theme V, *Increasing International Cooperation,* the resolutions committee developed a process whereby the delegate representative read the highest priority resolution of each small group. The delegates then identified overlaps with other resolutions, discussed the resolutions and voted. This process was later changed: delegates voted on each resolution and then voted later on whether to combine them with other resolutions. The four delegate representatives clarified and consolidated similar resolutions. Theme V used a ballot for ranking the highest priority resolutions, but allowed delegates to lobby for resolutions prior to voting.

After all of the theme sessions had gone through their processes, the general Resolutions Committee convened and, together with the general session moderator, established the working procedure for the first general voting session of the Conference. The procedure established by the moderator was that the priority resolutions from each theme would be read to the delegates. No voting was allowed at the first general voting session. The general Resolutions Committee was authorized to combine and reword similar resolutions which had come from the five theme sessions and to rework these resolutions for presentation and for voting at the final session. Seventeen such resolutions were presented by the Resolutions Committee.

Under the informal petition process for additional resolutions—those which had not come through the small workgroup and theme session process—a total of 32 such resolutions were submitted to the entire delegation for voting. A two-thirds vote of those delegates present and voting was required for a petition resolution to be considered by the entire body. The delegates voted to consider nine of the 32 resolutions that had been proposed and adopted these 9 resolutions. There were 49 resolutions on the paper ballot prepared by the Resolutions Committee. Of these, only four were defeated.

The delegates passed 64 resolutions—25 by voting in the general session and 39 by paper ballot. No ranking of the resolutions was done. As provided for in the Conference rules, a Committee of the Conference was established to approve the final wording of the resolutions. Transcripts of the general voting sessions, together with the recorder's annotated draft of the resolutions adopted, were sent to the Committee. Final wording of the resolutions was established by the Committee at a special meeting in Chicago, on January 5, 1980.

An Overview of the Proceedings

Thursday—November 15

More than 1,800 persons registered for the Conference on opening day. The day's events included a tour of the White House, the opening of the Information Center, and screenings of a variety of films dealing with both technical information processes and public awareness of library and information services. The films represented original productions by the library community and were optionally submitted by States. The schedule included a special period for States, groups of States, coalitions, and foundations to meet in caucuses.

The Conference was officially opened at an evening banquet by Charles Benton, Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and Chairman of the White House Conference. Abner J. Mikva, Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, conducted the swearing in of the delegates. The participants were welcomed by Marilyn Killebrew Gell, Director of the Conference, and Marion Barry, Mayor of Washington, D.C. Special awards were presented by Martin M. Cummings, Director of the National Library of Medicine, to seven individuals in recognition of their contribution to the Conference. These individuals were:

Channing L. Bete, Sr. (Posthumous)

U.S. Representative John Brademas (Indiana)

Carl A. Elliott (Former U.S. Representative from Alabama)

U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson (Washington)

Bessie Boehm Moore (Vice Chairman of NCLIS and Member of the Advisory Committee on the Conference)

U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell (Rhode Island)

U.S. Representative Carl D. Perkins (Kentucky)

Special remarks were presented by Richard M. Neustadt, Assistant Director, Domestic Policy Staff, The White House; U.S. Representative William D. Ford, Michigan; and U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits, New York.

The first general session, devoted to the adoption of the rules, was convened after the banquet, at 10:30 p.m. Judge Mikva served as moderator for the assembly, which adopted the rules within one and one-half hours, and adjourned at 12:15 a.m.

Friday—November 16

The second general session began at 9:30 a.m. with an address by President Carter. Five speakers then presented commentary on the five theme areas of the Conference. The speakers were:

Clara S. Jones, Member of NCLIS — *Personal Needs*

Francis Keppel, Director, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies — *Lifelong Learning*

Herbert D. Benington, Vice President, The MITRE Corporation — *Organizations and the Professions*

Major R. Owens, New York State Senator — *Governing Society*

Bernard Ostry, Deputy Minister of Communications for Canada — *International Cooperation and Understanding*

Luncheon featured a screening of a videotape, *Telefuture*, produced by the Library of Congress. The moderator was Robert Lee Chartrand, Senior Specialist in Information Policy and Technology, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress and a Member of the White House Conference Advisory Committee. Comments on the film were presented by Nicholas Johnson, Chairman, National Citizens Communications Lobby, and Robert B. Pfannkuch, President, Video Group, Bell & Howell Co.

Work sessions opened in the afternoon. Thirty-four work groups met individually to address issues in the five theme areas. Each group included 20 to 25 delegates who assembled in a roundtable format. These sessions were open to alternates, observers, and the press.

The first of three open hearings was also held in the afternoon. During the three hearings, a total of 68 persons presented testimony on issues and concerns, both as individuals and as spokespersons for organizations. The Friday hearing was presided over by Bessie Boehm Moore and Mildred Younger.

More than 1,000 persons attended an evening reception for delegates, sponsored by the American Library Association and the Library of Congress, held at the Library. Caucuses continued during the evening. In addition to State caucuses, caucuses were held by ethnic groups, youth and disabled, delegates-at-large, and professional organizations.

Four multimedia presentations were screened in the evening. These were produced by the University of Iowa, the University of Utah, Colorado State Library, and Mississippi State University.

Saturday—November 17

Work sessions continued in the morning, while the second open hearing took place. Horace E. Tate, Member of NCLIS, presided. During the luncheon, two guest speakers, Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas, and George Schrader, City Manager of Dallas, Texas, discussed pertinent issues within State and city governments. Warren G. Hill, Member of the Advisory Committee to the Conference, presided.

Work sessions and hearings continued in the afternoon. The third open hearing was presided over by William J. Welsh, Deputy Librarian of Congress.

James H. Boren, Founder and President of the International Association of Bureaucrats, was speaker at the evening banquet, presided over by Philip A. Sprague, Member of NCLIS.

In the evening, the delegates met in their theme groups to begin discussing and voting on the large number of resolutions that had come out of the small work sessions. The delegates created special committees to synthesize the recommendations from the small work groups. Called Resolutions Committees, these groups continued working during the night.

Sunday—November 18

Ecumenical religious services at the Conference site, conducted by the Chaplain's Office, U.S. Department of Defense, were attended by more than 200 persons. Ralph Nader was guest speaker at Sunday's luncheon.

Theme sessions were reconvened to review the work of the Resolutions Committee. In the afternoon, a general session was convened to consider the recommendations from each theme session. Voting was done using electronic voting machines. The combined Resolutions Committee was given responsibility for further synthesis of recommendations.

In the evening, delegates were entertained as guests of five embassies and the Department of State at special receptions.

Monday—November 19

The final general session was convened in the morning. Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian of Congress, addressed the delegates. The body then approved 64 resolutions and also established a Committee of the Conference to oversee the final draft of the text.

A joint congressional hearing took place at the Conference site. Testimony from 10 individuals was heard by 10 members of the Congress.

The Conference concluded with a luncheon address by Stuart E. Eizenstat, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy.

Outreach

During the two-year period of pre-Conferences and the five-day Conference period in Washington, a wellspring of public awareness spread throughout the Nation through articles in newspapers, magazines, newsletters, and radio and television broadcasts. More than 3,500 newspaper, magazine and newsletter clippings appeared in the national press from September 1977 to January 1980. Articles appeared in the *New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Library Journal, American Libraries, Los Angeles Times*, and *Time*.

Before the national public relations campaign began in September 1978, public awareness efforts centered on each State and Territorial pre-Conference. In the Spring of 1978, the Conference staff and the American Library Association, cosponsored three regional workshops on public relations. Since these efforts were not coordinated on a national level, they varied in scope and technique. Some States, such as Virginia, employed professional public relations firms. Others, such as West Virginia, coordinated efforts through their State libraries and State library agencies. Widespread publicity resulted from the efforts of Frederic J. Glazer, the West Virginia State librarian, who conceived and coordinated a nationwide pubticity campaign for the Conference using the theme "Be with a book for a day." Many other state librarians, publishers, celebrities and business people lent support to the campaign. Still other States relied on a corps of dedicated citizen volunteers working with librarians.

In November 1978, the Conference staff adopted an official public relations plan designed to create the widest public and delegate awareness, interest, and support for the White House Conference. This included assistance in media contact and public relations to the State public relations coordinators. The State coordinators worked with NCLIS and the Conference staff, the library and general media, special groups and organizations, and library and information services organizations, to create a national public relations program.

The Conference staff developed informational materials, including a fact sheet, a chronology of events leading to the Conference, and brochures. They also commissioned the design and printing of a poster, "Bringing Information to People."

To expand coverage of pre-Conference events, the staff developed a working press list of media contacts including the library and education press, Washington bureaus of major national newspapers, home offices of major newspapers, and news wire services.

In July 1979, the public relations firm of Ruder and Finn was commissioned to enlarge the media outreach program, and support nationwide activities.

With the cooperation of the American Library Association, the staff developed a kit for members of Congress to assist them in disseminating information to their constituents. A souvenir postal cachet was developed for distribution to the delegates; and, through a special arrangement with the Postal Service, more than 60 percent of the mail originating in Washington, D.C. in September and November 1979 was cancelled with a White House Conference imprint.

A daily newspaper was published during the Conference, serving as a Conference edition of *WHC Update*, a newsletter launched in January 1979. A recording studio was set up where delegates could make 30-second radio interview tapes to be mailed to home-town radio stations. Delegates received press releases designed for publication in their home-town newspapers.

Spokespersons for the Conference participated in radio and television programs, made speeches discussing the Conference goals, and were interviewed by members of the press around the Nation.

Innovations

During the pre-Conference planning phase and during the Conference itself, the White House Conference planners used several innovative approaches, including sophisticated information technology, teleconferencing, audio-tape briefings, and a comprehensive information center. Innovative approaches were also used in designing the Conference structure and in conducting the Conference itself.

Planning

One of the most successful and cost-effective techniques employed in the planning phase was a telecommunications system called computer conferencing. Members of the Advisory Committee to the White House Conference used this system from June 1979 until the week before the Conference. This was the first time that a system of this type was used in planning a White House Conference.

Another application of communications technology involved the use of the six-part audio-tape series, *Dialogues on the Future of Library and Information Services,* to brief the delegates on Conference issues.

Organizations dealing with information services also contributed to the planning of the Conference. More than 60 executives, directors and presidents of information-related organizations met in May 1979 in Washington to discuss the objectives of the White House Conference. The meeting was co-sponsored by the American Society for Information Science and the White House Conference staff, and it represented the first time that computer, communications, micrographics, information industry, library, scientific, educational and public interest groups had met together to discuss the implications of the Information Age.

The officials who attended also discussed ways to involve each organization in the Conference process, defined substantive issues to be addressed at the Conference, and made plans for implementing Conference recommendations.

Process

The call for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services was itself an innovation. No previous White House Conference has dealt with a topic that affects all residents of the United States and its Territories in so many aspects of their lives.

The overall Conference themes and major issues were determined through the political processes of the State and Territory conferences, group meetings, and other special topic conferences. The major concern of the Conference planners was that the interests of all citizens and residents of the United States should be recognized.

An important aspect of the working process was the broad base of many small groups within the theme sessions of the Conference, culminating in the final general sessions. This was a replication of the process begun at local, regional and State levels.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services was a political process. The Conference rules were the subject of unusually intense discussion and communication prior to and at the beginning of the White House Conference.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services was the first to establish a fully functioning information center, to answer questions from delegates. Its resources included books and printed materials, as well as computerized data bases.

The resolutions processes for the Conference afforded a variety of routes for delegates and others to present their resolutions for consideration.

While open hearings are common practice among White House Conferences, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services designed the open hearings as an integral part of the Conference process. Many organizations, interest groups and individuals were invited to testify. Thus, the hearings brought into the process additional views and ideas that might otherwise not have been voiced.

No previous White House Conference has included in its closing sessions a congressional hearing, held off the site of Capitol Hill. This hearing resulted from concerted work by the staff of the major Senate and Congressional Committees of the U.S. Congress and NCLIS staff.

Documentation

In March 1980, a special report on the Conference was made to representatives of the President. The form of this report was a 20-minute videotape documenting the purpose, activities and outcomes of the Conference. Following the screening of the videotape, *Bringing Information to People,* Conference officials presented the White House representatives with a presentation edition of a multimedia documentation of the Conference. Included were the videotape, audiotapes of all major sessions, mocrofiche of all pre-Conference publications, and a special 100-page monograph, *Final Report: Summary,* which included the text of the resolutions and the proposed programs and legislation.

Accepting the report on behalf of the President were: Richard Harden, special assistant to the President for information management; Alfred Stern, associate director of the White House domestic policy staff; and Richard Neustadt, assistant director of the White House domestic policy staff.

Applications of New Technology and Service Approaches

The Conference itself provided a demonstration of two innovative Information Age approaches to providing improved library and information services. These were a relatively new communications technology called "computer conferencing" and a multi-resource "information center."

The Conference, which itself required the collection and retrieval of information of all types, was an ideal arena for utilizing and displaying aspects of much of what was discussed by the delegates. Post-Conference evaluation of the use of computer conferencing and the information center indicated that these processes provided unusually effective levels of efficiency, relevance, and cost effectiveness. Neither process has been utilized in previous White House Conferences. Both are summarized here.

Computer Conferencing

The development of capabilities for access to computers from remote locations, using easily transportable terminals, has made it feasible to use them for what is called "computer conferencing." The basic idea is that a central computer can serve as an intermediary among a group of people wishing to communicate with one another. The computer can receive messages, storing them for later transmission to other people; it can facilitate the writing of messages, by providing capability for "word processing;" it can organize and keep track of messages; and it can retrieve messages. This computer application is called "computer conferencing" because it facilitates the kinds of communication one hopes to achieve in a conference, and does so in ways that add significantly to the process. For example, by providing a permanent record of the communication, in a form easily retrievable when needed, the computer conference assures that communication is reliable and does not depend upon the uncertainties of memory.

The Advisory Committee and staff of the White House Conference used computer conferencing to coordinate the planning processes for the November Conference. Thirty individuals received terminals and training in their use. The resulting interactive network of communicators numbered 38 and extended throughout the United States including Hawaii. A grant from the National Science Foundation made this project possible. The information system utilized was the Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES), operating from the New Jersey Institute of Technology. The terminals (TI 765, with bubble memory) were loaned to the White House Conference planners by Texas Instruments.

A knowledge of the capabilities of EIES is essential to understand the process. EIES staff have described these capabilities as follows:

> The Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES) is a computer conferencing system, operating at the New Jersey Institute of Technology, which uses the abilities of a computer to facilitate human group communications. This system links almost 800 people throughout North America and Europe, and

is an organized communications space providing various flexible structures for the exchange of information. The computer stores and processes messages, conference comments, and notebook pages until users sign on and receive them at their convenience, thereby minimizing the barriers of time and space and permitting communications among those who are geographically dispersed, at a cost below that of phone, mail, and travel. This new communications medium includes the advantages of written transcripts, user self-paced interaction, work from the convenience of office or home, and advanced text processing and other programmed features. The use of EIES by the White House Conference was an example of the application of this system for meeting and conference-planning purposes, since groups of widely dispersed users sent on-line messages to make individual arrangements, used electronic conferences to form joint decisions and plans, drafted agenda, and other material in computerized notebooks.

A number of "group conferences" were established, enabling the members of each of the various Advisory Committee sub-committees in the planning process to communicate easily with each other. Group conferences took place for delegate preparation, program, project implementation, public relations, delegate selection, exhibits, logistics, and the information center. For example, the Sub-committee on the Information Center included White House Conference staff members, members of the Advisory Committee, and personnel from the Library of Congress. Messages relayed to the Information Center were immediately available to the entire group, regardless of physical location.

In addition, group conferences were established that included all participants. These facilitated the "broadcast" of relevant information and served as a means for keeping everyone up to date on developments.

EIES was used for:

- linking the Advisory Committee members with each other and the staff;
- internal staff communications, especially when travelling;
- handling the selection of the National delegates: processing nominations, linking the sub-committees, and establishing guidelines;
- demonstrating interactive computer conferencing as a communication and information tool at the Conference; and
- follow-up after the Conference to aid in implementing the recommendations.

An evaluation of the use of computer conferencing by the Conference is included in the appendices to this report.

The Information Center

The Information Center provided information services for the delegates in support of the work that they would be expected to accomplish at the Conference. Growing out of earlier plans for a large-scale exhibit, the center also was designed to provide a functional demonstration of how the resources of library and information services could meet people's information needs.

The Center occupied about 12,000 square feet of the Exhibit Hall of the Washington Hilton Hotel. This space, located directly inside the main entrance of the Hall was organized into four main activity areas: information-on-demand, Conference communications, State resolutions, and blind and physically handicapped media.

Information-On-Demand

Information-On-Demand Area (IODA) was the focal point of the Center. Its basic design, staffing, and resources were identified and coordinated by a working committee of administrative and reference staff of the Library of Congress. The primary function of the IODA was to act as a library reference and information service for the delegates. This component contained a wide array of information resources, including:

○ *More than 100 computerized data bases,* provided by on-line service suppliers and database producers. Immediate retrieval of data, either on VTR screens or via on-line printers, was made possible by trained volunteer operators. The range of information available encompassed facts and figures, finance and funding, and editorial and public opinion.

○ *A reference book collection* of more than 400 titles. This collection was selected by the Library of Congress staff and was collected and organized by The Combined Book Exhibit company. A catalog of the collection was prepared for public distribution.

○ *General information files* related to the five major themes and issues of the Conference. These included clippings, pamphlets, brochures, bibliographies, and other sources. The files were compiled by the Library of Congress staff.

○ *Newswire machines* from the Associated Press and United Press International. These ran continuously during the Center's working hours.

○ *Access to the collections* of both local and distant libraries and information centers by telephone and telefacsimile. For example, the Regional Energy/Environment Information Center at the Denver Public Library transmitted documents to the Conference Center via telefacsimile.

○ *Equipment,* including: eight computer terminals and printers, two telefacsimile machines, microfilm and microfiche reader/printers, cassette tape recorders, and a photocopy machine.

More than 100 professional public service librarians skilled in using these resources volunteered their services as staff for the IODA. They represented libraries and information centers throughout the nation.

The services of the IODA were available to all Conference participants, either in person or by telephone. A special telephone system was installed in the hotel to connect each of the 34 workgroup meeting rooms to the Information Center. When appropriate, specific documents—photocopies, computer printouts—were prepared and delivered directly to the inquirer or working group by volunteer runners. Staff provided forms for requests that they could not answer immediately.

Because of the tremendous volume of demand for IODA services, it was not possible to maintain accurate statistics on its use. Records compiled by the Library of Congress coordinating staff indicate that more than 1,000 questions were asked. Of these, three-fourths were directly related to the work of the Conference. The remainder were requests for information of general or personal interest.

Conference Communications

The Conference Communications Area consisted of two sub-areas: the "EIES" Area and the Message Center. EIES (Electronic Information Exchange System), a computer-based communications system, was used at the Conference to allow delegates to keep track of the progress of other workgroups. A daily newsletter produced on EIES was made available on-line to any member of the EIES system throughout the country. This newsletter included summaries of resolutions and events at the Conference.

Message Center

The Message Center included not only personal message boxes for each Conference delegate and alternate but also an "electronic bulletin board." This was a closed-circuit television system driven by a microcomputer-based character-generator. Here, daily Conference schedules were posted, last-minute changes in the schedule announced, and special events highlighted. Any Conference participant could use this system to post Conference-related information.

State Resolutions Area

The State Resolutions Area provided on-line access to more than 3,000 resolutions produced at the State/Territorial pre-White House Conferences. Through the INQUIRE database management system, and services provided by the National Library of Medicine, volunteer staff ran "searches," using portable computer terminals. A variety of information was retrievable. For example, the number of resolutions on a given topic, such as networking, produced by any one State, or a given group of States, or all States. Such a grouping of resolutions could be retrieved by the total number of resolutions, by the names of the States which produced them, by the title of the resolutions, and/or by the full text of the resolutions.

Blind and Physically Handicapped Media

The Blind and Physically Handicapped Media Area was available to provide on-demand copies of Conference-related information on audiocassettes or in Braille format, for handicapped delegates and alternates. In addition, talking-book machines were available for loan to blind delegates. This area also provided access to two of the latest developments in computer technology for handicapped persons: the Kurzweil Reading Machine, which transforms printed material into synthesized speech, and a Digicassette Machine capable of producing Braille transcription from the output of a computer terminal. Among the services provided by this area was the complete recording of the resolutions that were taken to the floor for final discussion and voting on the last day of the Conference. The facilities and the sixteen volunteer staff in this area were made available to the Conference by the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped of the Library of Congress.

The White House
Conference on Library and
Information Services, 1979

Proceedings:
Transcripts
and Speeches

November 15, 1979: Formal Opening

Greetings of Charles Benton

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Good evening ladies and gentlemen, delegates, alternates, and distinguished guests. It is my honor to welcome you to the official opening of the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

For me personally this is a proud occassion. It was a year ago last month that President Carter appointed me Chairman of the Conference and of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. If I had known then what I know now, I may not have accepted this appointment so readily. But, in fact, the past year has been one of the most educational, exciting years of my life. I can hardly believe that this historic occasion is indeed underway.

For some people with us tonight, this is the culmination of a lifetime of service in their community, within their profession, in State and national legislatures. We will pay tribute to some of the pioneers of this Conference later this evening. For others, we hope the next four days will be an encouragement to continue a cause that they have joined.

You know, we represent quite an interesting microcosm of our society. Among us are representatives of every State and Territory, young and senior, seasoned librarians and interested lay people, judges, State representatives, authors, poets, candlemakers, coal miners, teachers, ministers, rabbis, a dentist, a nun, and a former prisoner of war.

We are joined in several purposes. We want to take a fresh look at our library and information needs in the light of a knowledge explosion and the new technology created to deal with it. We also will try to redefine the institutional roles, priorities, and relationships to better meet those needs through the 1980's and beyond. That will require the discipline of working together to make some hard choices. We want to increase public awareness of the state of the art and of the attendant public policy questions, and we want to create a clear statement about the critical nature of library and information services in our democratic society. Without making too strained an analogy, I hope I can say we are all linked for the gathering, processing, and retrieval of information for a purpose.

The Conference has been organized into the theme areas, work sessions, plenary sessions; the circuitry, so to speak, is here and the current is on. We are soliciting many individual contributions to the problems at hand, so that we can arrive at a collective wisdom greater than what a single person could achieve.

To reach this beginning took 22 years, but given the speed with which changes occur today, we will have to affect changes and bring about the Conference recommendations at a faster clip. The energy in this room should help propel us forward.

Tonight is an evening for celebration and for thanks to some of those without whose leadership we would not be here. It is also a time to hear from some of our friends at the White House and in Congress about their hopes and expectations for this event. And finally, tonight we will adopt the rules that will guide us through this Conference.

Before we begin, I want to pay a special, personal tribute to my predecessor as Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and of this Conference, Fred Burkhardt. Through Fred's dedicated efforts, NCLIS became an institution of national leadership that commands respect. I also want to thank you, Fred, for the generous help and advice you gave me in easing my transition into this difficult assignment. We're honored to have you with us as Chairman Emeritus.

The first order of business is the official swearing in of the delegates. Judge Abner Mikva, of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, will officiate.

Swearing In of Delegates

JUDGE MIKVA: Would all of the delegates and alternate delegates please rise? Please raise your right hand and repeat after me: "I," and here repeat your name, "do hereby affirm that I will discharge the duties and responsibilities entrusted to me as a delegate to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services to the best of my ability." Congratulations.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: I would like to introduce the head table, starting with Dr. Richard Farley, Deputy Director for Technical Information, Science and Education Administration of the National Library of Agriculture. Fred Burkhardt has already been introduced. Richard Neustadt, Assistant Director of Domestic Policy Staff, the White House. Eileen Cooke, Director of the District of Columbia Office of the American Library Association. The Honorable Carl Elliott, former U.S. Representative from Alabama and now a delegate from that State. The Honorable William D. Ford, U.S. Representative from Michigan, and a member of the White House Conference Advisory Committee. The Honorable Carl Perkins, U.S. Representative from Kentucky.

And starting way at the other end of the table, William Welsh, Deputy of Library of Congress, who also serves for Daniel Boorstin on the National Commission. Next, Channing Bete, Jr., chairman of the Massachusetts delegation to the White House Conference. Dr. Martin Cummings, Director of the National Library of Medicine. Edmund Reggie, Executive Counsel to Governor Edwin Edwards of Louisiana, who will serve as moderator of some of the Conference sessions. Bernard Ostry, Deputy Administrator of Communication for Canada. The Honorable Marion Barry, Mayor of the District of Columbia. The Honorable John Brademas, U.S. Representative from Indiana. Marian Gallagher, member of the White House Conference Advisory Committee. The Honorable Chaiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island. Bessie Moore, Vice Chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and member of the White House Conference Advisory Committee. And Senator Jacob Javits from New York State.

Now, it gives me great pleasure to introduce Marilyn Gell, the Director of this Conference and a person who has performed miracles to help make this Conference a reality.

Remarks of Marilyn Killebrew Gell

MS. GELL: The usual way one begins a speech is to say good evening ladies and gentlemen. Instead, I would like to begin tonight by saying hello to John, Maria, Dick, Mike, Boyd, Timothy, Susan, Bob, and each and every one of you. Welcome.

Tonight we come together, many of us, to meet for the first time. Each harbours hopes and dreams, and maybe even a few complaints. But whatever we bring with us, we are now finally, after many years of expectation, together; and together we share a vision. The specifics of that vision may be different, but it is safe to say that we share a vision of a better, brighter world.

In a very real and important way, the future can be ours. But it is equally true that we get the future we deserve, because in living the present, we make the future inevitable. Each of us approaches the task of creation and that is, after all, what we are about, from a slightly different perspective. Some of us honor and revere tradition, established values, the enduring importance of history. Others of us are "present" people, and respond primarily to the options and opportunities that innovation, technology, and continuing change make available. Still others look to the future; we dream dreams, we see visions, and we find ourselves uncomfortable with the fact that dreams and visions are so slowly realized.

In individual lives, in conferences, and in the lives of institutions and societies, each of these approaches is not only of equal value, but is equally essential. To make a conference, an institution, or a government productive, we must encompass all views. We must value the past, and find in it a foundation and a touchstone. We must acknowledge the present, for that after all is the current reality; and we must reach into the future, because it becomes so quickly the present and so irreversibly the past.

We are not the first group to gather in trust and in hope. More than 200 years ago another group met. It was not a White House Conference, but like this Conference, it was heavily political. One of the delegates to that meeting was Thomas Jefferson. It was a conference that revolutionized the political process and set in motion a form of government that we still enjoy. It was based on the deep belief that people should determine their own destinies. The deliberations of that group have reverberated through history. Democracy depends on citizen participation, on the bringing together not of the same views, but of dissimilar opinions and perspectives that can be united to produce a living, changing, responsive form of government.

Tonight, and for the next four days, you will be a public part of that process. You will make decisions that can effect the way we live for the last 20 years of this century. You will do this in an open, democratic fashion, filled undoubtedly with debate, and sometimes even dissent. It is the American way. The task before you is a formidable one. Not only will your deliberations be part of the grand tradition, but you will be discussing issues that go to the heart of our form of government—access to information.

In 1787, Thomas Jefferson noted that the way to preserve the government that we enjoy is to give the people full information through the channel of the public papers and to contrive that those papers should penetrate the whole mass of the people. The channels now are more numerous than they were in Jefferson's time. They include libraries, television, and a whole host of other information services that I won't now enumerate. But the principle remains intact. The success of our form of government rests finally on an informed citizenry.

Like the delegates to the Second Continental Congress, you will be addressing some of the fundamental problems of our time. Your task is to advise and recommend actions that will build on the best of the past, that are tempered by the realities of the present, and that will create a world in which information continues to be the basis of freedom. It is a noble task.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Ladies and gentlemen, I next present Mayor Marion Barry of the District of Columbia, our magnificent host city.

Remarks of Marion Barry, Jr.

MAYOR BARRY: Thank you, Chairman Benton. Distinguished Members of Congress, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. It is with great pleasure that I bring to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services the greetings and best wishes of the District of Columbia government. I regret very much that I'm not going to be able to spend a great deal of time with you; but as you know, being Mayor of this great city, I wake up every morning not wondering if there is going to be a crisis—the question is when it's going to be, how much, and how long.

But we're represented here by five outstanding delegates from the District, including the head of our public library system, Hardy Franklin. So you can rest assured that we are ably represented. Also, let me welcome you to a city which is more than just monuments, and more than just bureaucrats, and more than just the President and Members of Congress. This is a city of over 700,000 residents who make this their home.

Let me also welcome you to what I describe as the last colony; that is, we're the only group of 700,000 American citizens in the United States of American who can't vote for our Senators and our Representatives. As Judge Mikva was administering the oath of office to you, I was thinking how nice it would be when he or someone else could administer the oath of office to two Senators from the District of Columbia.

As Ms. Cell was speaking about Thomas Jefferson, and the great debates of the 1780's, and about taxation without representation, I was reminded of our own city. So I'd like to ask that when you go back to your States, and we finish working hard about library systems and informational services, that you also work hard to help us pass our Constitutional amendment, which will give us two Senators and two Representatives. Between now and January, if you live in California or in Pennsylvania, we need your help there because the amendment is alive and well, but it hasn't passed yet.

Also let me indicate that as Mayor of the District of Columbia, I pay a great deal of attention to the large network of public libraries, such as the District of Columbia's magnificent central library, the Martin Luther King Memorial Library Building. We have a network of more than 170 public school libraries; the libraries of the University of the District of Columbia; the libraries maintained by the individual agencies and departments of the District government. In addition to the District's publicly supported libraries, I have to mention the giant Library of Congress and literally hundreds of other Federal libraries located in the District—23 academic libraries and 294 private and special libraries. In fact, we are called the city of libraries, and we're also called the library capital of the world. But large or small, unique or popular, specialized or general, libraries are the very living heart and soul of our city. And we love them, we support them, and we use them.

The city of Washington, more than any other leading city, is dependent upon information and knowledge. Nowhere in the world is the old truth that knowledge equals power so vividly and so clearly demonstrated than here. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who need to be their own government must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.

Being born in Mississippi, and growing up in Memphis, Tennessee, education was constantly pointed to me as a way out of the ghetto. Reading was one of the recommended vehicles, but in my day it wasn't real reading—it was academic and theoretical. We also found, growing up in my day, that reading for one's enjoyment was for the most part a luxury. I think for too many of our young people in our inner city, reading for enjoyment is still a luxury. We have to change that around. But when people have to worry about a place to stay, and food to eat, and clothing to wear, they don't have much time to think about reading a book for enjoyment. So we have to put together the living and social conditions of our city, along with the reading conditions of our city.

Some people are fortunate enough to be born in circumstances where role models are provided—in other words, the road was paved, the only thing they had to do was get on it and move into the door of opportunity. But for too many of our people there are no roads, and there are few opportunities. We need to figure out how we can do a lot better.

Also, we notice that around the country resources are drying up as related to libraries. Politicians and council people and others find that it's very easy to cut the library budget, because there is no major organized constituency. Therefore, it seems to me that you ought to put on your agenda how to better organize yourselves politically, because politicians understand votes and not talk. I think the Members of Congress understand what I'm talking about.

During the summer, the Librarian of the Congress, Daniel Boorstin, visited me. We talked about libraries and what I could do for them as Mayor. I've tried to do all I can in this city to assure that as we make budgetary decisions the library system is not left out. The library system of the District of Columbia is one of the few agencies this year that did not receive a recommended cut from me, because I believe in that system.

This Conference can be very meaningful to all of us if we take back to our local communities some of the things that we are learning here. It seems to me that as you deliberate and look at the great issues of the day, you have to bring them into some sense of reality, because too many conferences are left with empty promises and false hopes and visions that don't materialize.

On behalf of the 700,000 citizens of the District of Columbia, I welcome you to our great city. And if I didn't ask you while you are here to spend some money, I would be derelict in my responsibilities, because cities run on money. Everybody wants to know where we're going to get more money from. If you spend a lot more here, maybe Hardy Franklin can get a lot more next year when budget time comes.

Let me just express my great delight in being invited here. I get about 250 invitations a week to speak, and I just asked my appointment secretary to make sure she blocked out some time for me to come to say hello to you. You'll find in most cities and most counties and most States, some politicians are not very responsive to people when they talk about libraries. I wanted to show that we in the District have a different breed of politicians who show we do care about libraries and information systems. My presence here is an indication of that. Thank you very, very much, and good luck in all your deliberations.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Thank you, Mayor Barry, for that most inspiring introduction to our Conference. You have set a marvelous, passionate tone for us; and your call for political action most surely will be heeded.

Ladies and gentlemen, I present next Dr. Martin Cummings, Director of one of our Nation's great Federal libraries, the National Library of Medicine. Martin combines in one person the skills of librarianship and information science at their best. Furthermore, the National Library of Medicine is as good a model of a national library and information service as any that can be found in this country.

Presentation of Awards

DR. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Charles. I want to offer a special greeting on behalf of your three national libraries.

It is for me a great privilege to participate in this ceremony. We are about to honor the leaders whose farsighted wisdom made it possible to hold the Nation's first public forum on the subject of libraries and information services. I must admit, it is a unique position for me to preside over an assemblage that includes a number of distinguished Senators and Congressmen, some of whom I have testified before. It is a gratifying turnaround to have them on the receiving end for a change.

U.S. Representative John Brademas, Congressman from Indiana, has made his name synonymous with legislation on behalf of education, the arts, humanities, museums, and public libraries since 1959. With deep appreciation we acknowledge his role in legislation authorizing a permanent National Commission on Libraries. I also should point out that, with Minority Leader Gerald Ford, in 1973 he sponsored the joint resolution authorizing the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: Thank you very much, sir. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleagues, ladies and gentlemen. I'm very grateful to my old friend and your leader, Charles Benton, for letting me speak first. But like my leader on the Committee on Education and Labor, Carl Perkins, I have yet a couple of more meetings to get to. That's the way most of us live our lives here.

But I want you to know how enormously grateful I am to you for the honor that you do me. I'm especially pleased to receive this certificate, as I do so on the same evening at which my old friend Abner Mikva, now a distinguished judge, is with us. And my chairman during most of my years of service in the House of Representatives, Carl Perkins, is here, as well as my current chairman, Bill Ford, who's giving great leadership in the field of libraries and higher education; and my beloved colleagues from the other body, Jake Javits and Claiborne Pell, with whom I've worked so closely on all of these matters.

I want to say just a quick word about libraries. I grew up in libraries. My late grandfather was a high school superintendent and a college teacher in a little town of 700 people in Indiana. In that little town, he had a house in which he had a library of some 5,000 books. I grew up in that library; it was a school of mine. Therefore, I've always been very grateful for what doors of learning libraries can open. Later on in life, I've had the opportunity to study in some of the great libraries of the world—the Widener, the Bodleian, and the Biblioteque Nationale in other countries—but I've never forgotten that library in my grandfather's home in a little town in Indiana.

That's one of the reasons that, when I went to Congress 21 years ago, I asked to serve on the committee that wrote education legislation. Since then I have worked with all of the colleagues whom you are seeing at this head table on elementary and secondary school libraries, higher education libraries, the Library Services and Construction Act, the National Commission, and the White House Conference.

Let us never forget the intimate relationship between a free society and open libraries. The friends of freedom are the friends of libraries.

I've got to say one more word. I did not realize that here tonight was one of the greatest human beings I've ever met in Congress or out, and an inspiration to all of us who knew him—our former colleague in the House, Carl Elliott of Alabama. He's a great man. Once again, thank you.

DR. CUMMINGS: A member of the House of Representatives from Kentucky since 1948, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee since 1967, Congressman Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky was a principle backer of the Library Services and Construction Act. He is one of those who worked tirelessly on behalf of the National Defense Education Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Medical Library Assistance Act, and other key legislation, including the bill which brought us together tonight. For his outstanding and effective efforts in the U.S. Congress to make library and information services available to all Americans, we honor him tonight. Mr. Perkins.

REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: Dr. Cummings, ladies and gentlemen, and my colleagues, Senator Javits and Senator Pell. I was elected with Harry Truman in 1948, when no one thought Harry Truman was going to get to first base. In 1949, Carl Elliott and I sponsored a Rural Highway Bill. We were representing rural people, more or less, at that time. We thought the people in the cities had got the advantage, through grants from Carnegie and other people, and had better libraries, and the rural people had scarcely anthing. We had a $5 million bill in the House of Representatives in 1949-50 that had passed the Senate and lost by two votes in the House of Representatives. We struggled until 1956, and we combined resources with representatives from cities, as we should have in the first place; and we passed the bill.

Naturally, libraries have not faired as well in the Congresses as they perhaps should have faired, but we have made much progress. And in this White House Conference, we wish you well. You will have the full cooperation of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Bill Ford's subcommittee has jurisdiction over the library legislation primarily. And I want to say a word on behalf of my friends from the Senate, Senators Javits and Pell, who have been leaders in the forefront for the library people in the American Library Association ever since I've been in the Congress.

Dr. Cummings, I accept this citation with much pride, but I realize that the credit belongs to you people and everybody else that has made this occasion possible. We want to move forward into the future. I thank you.

DR. CUMMINGS: Now may I present a tribute to two members of the same family, father and son. Twenty-two years ago Channing Bete, a library trustee from Greenfield, Massachusetts, suggested the idea of a White House Conference on Libraries to the American Library Trustees Association. Mr. Bete did not live to see the realization of his efforts. But with us tonight is his son, Channing Bete, Jr., to whom we present an award in memory of his father and in appreciation of his own outstanding leadership on the Citizens Advisory Committee with the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services.

MR. BETE: On behalf of my father, I thank all of you for this. He would have been proud. I would share one aspect of this that he shared with me. He never saw this White House Conference as an end in itself; he never saw this as an end at all. He saw this really as the beginning. He would have welcomed all of you here to make that beginning—a beginning now for the 1980's and 1990's—and to make libraries come to life and serve the people of our Nation in perhaps ways they haven't been served before. But let's make a good beginning here. On behalf of his memory, and of my family, I thank you.

DR. CUMMINGS: Now it gives me great pleasure to introduce Carl A. Elliott, former U.S. Representative from Alabama. Mr. Elliott wrote the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and was a guiding force in congressional passage of the original Library Services and Construction Act. In recognition of your ardent and enduring library support through almost two decades of congressional service, we are pleased to present you with this certificate of appreciation.

MR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman and friends, in all my time in public life, I've never known a White House Conference to be held that there didn't grow out of it much good. I'm looking forward with anticipation, as a citizen of this Republic, to the many good things that we may be able to do here during this Conference. It's a pleasure to be with you and to be with my old colleagues of the years gone by. Thank you.

DR. CUMMINGS: Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island is the Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and the Humanities, as well as Chairman of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee. We recognize him tonight for his leadership and support of legislation for the establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for his special role as the original sponsor of legislation to authorize the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. We thank him profoundly for his continual guidance of legislation relating to libraries, education, the arts, and the humanities.

SENATOR PELL: Thank you, Chairman Cummings, and old friend Charles Benton. I guess all of us are fellow book lovers—we're here because of that fact, I remember when my children were small, and they didn't treat a book with the courtesy and the gentleness I felt they should, I'd say, "Don't forget, the book is a friend." In fact, as life goes on we very often find it's one of our best friends. And I think it's this respect, reverence, and affection for books and for learning that binds us all together.

So I congratulate you on being here, as well as on the fact that you've learned something of the political process in getting here. Some of you are alternates paid for by your own States, some of you are delegates paid for by Uncle Sam; but you all fought hard and you recognized in each case the importance of the political process in obtaining your objectives. I thank you, we all thank you, for coming here. This is an example of citizen involvement as it should be. I know in my own State, I went to a meeting of one of the regional groups, and they were going at it lickety split. They were really taking ideas and thrashing them out. This was going on across the length and breadth of Rhode Island; and if anything goes the length and breadth of Rhode Island, you know it's covered a lot of ground and a lot of territory.

We should recognize that the Federal Government picks up about one cent out of every 10 that's spent, so we have a responsibility in the Congress to understand your thoughts; and if we think they're wise, to follow them. I hope that in this Conference you will focus on Federal involvement and will give thought to various problems that we face. For example, in our Education Subcommittee we have actually postponed making a decision concerning the National Periodical Center until after your Conference, because we're interested in what your recommendations may be.

So don't feel that you will make a recommendation and it will float off into outer space. We are interested in them, waiting for them and for your reactions to ideas that I hope will surface—like the thought of challenge grants, which the NEA is doing and which you could develop in your own communities. The elimination of functional illiteracy, which is still so much with us—perhaps less extreme than it was 10 or 20 years ago in some cases—but the depth and breadth of illiteracy, I think, is larger now. The average letter that comes in is less well written, and the average degree of literacy among the so-called educated people, college graduates, has obviously gone down in the last few years, to my regret.

These are all ideas that I hope will surface, so we on the Hill will be able to know what you're thinking and can try to do our best for the taxpayers, to help you help the cause of libraries across the country. Good luck, and thank you.

DR. CUMMINGS: The award being presented to U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington will be received by Marian G. Gallagher, a member of the White House Conference Advisory Committee, who is from Seattle. During 35 years of congressional service from the State of Washington, Senator Magnuson's leadership has been of great assistance to the library and education communities. His support of legislation led to passage of the Library Services and Construction Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Medical Library Assistance Act, the establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the legislation leading to this Conference. Ms. Gallagher, please convey this award to Senator Magnuson on behalf of 50 million consumers of library and information services.

MS. GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. If Senator Magnuson were here in person, he might say something splendid about the State of Washington, so I think I ought to do that, too. We have Senator Magnuson, and in a true resource-sharing spirit, we share him with all of you. He does indeed value information; he knows its power and he does everything he can to make it more widely available. In the past, I've thanked him many times for aid to education so it's a turnabout for me to be able to accept an award on his behalf from the Conference. We're going to carry this award back to him tomorrow, conveyed by a very carefully selected delegation. I'm hoping that none of you will think that its too utterly partisan if the convoy carries the Washington State flag. Thank you, for the Senator.

DR. CUMMINGS: I should add that if Senator Magnuson were here, I would add a special note of thanks for his patronage and support of the marvelous new facility being constructed in Bethesda, Maryland, in honor of a distinguished former Senator of Alabama, Senator Lister Hill.

I have deliberately withheld the citation for Bessie B. Moore, Vice Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and a member of the White House Conference Advisory Committee. Tonight we call attention to your enthusiastic promotion of library causes for more than five decades. Your tireless efforts, both in your home State of Arkansas and in the Nation, to win citizen participation in directing the future of the Nation's libraries and information services, have won our appreciation and gratitude. In addition we pay homage to your undisputed rule as the "corporate memory" for the Commission and the Conference. Bessie, we thank you.

MS. MOORE: As you may imagine, this is certainly an emotional experience for me. I look back over long years of interest in libraries and remember many occasions that I won't have time to talk to you about tonight. With the exception of Senator Javits, I have testified before every single one of these Members of Congress and their committees over a number of years.

I happened to be the national president of the Library Trustee Association when Channing Bete said to me, "What a wonderful thing it would be to have a White House Conference." I remember that, and I remember his very deep thinking and his gracious manner and his thoughtfulness for the future. He said to me one time, "Wouldn't it be wonderful to live for the next 20 years? I wish I could." He didn't, but I am here and I want to pay tribute especially to his memory.

Then I remember some other times when we had an Advisory Commission appointed by President Johnson. Carl Elliott and I went all over the country holding hearings, which was really a great experience. I look at your faces tonight, here in this room, and I see many who have given me the opportunity to serve with you at many a library conference. I even see a former college professor of mine; I'll have to admit he's younger than I am, but I thought I'd like to tell you he's here.

I would like to say to those of you who are delegates—and perhaps this is your first experience working with libraries—that the finest people you'll ever meet are those that work in this cause. I know, because I see so many of my friends out there.

I'm especially pleased to get this award. I'll hang it in a prominent place and always enjoy it. I'd like to say to our good friends here who have voted the money for this Conference, that it's well to start off with something wonderful; and I'll have to say that the Congress of the United States set a good table for our first experience.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Thank you, Marty Cummings and our award recipients, for being here tonight. We're delighted to have with us three men to whom we owe a great deal, a representative of the White House and two Members of Congress who serve on the White House Conference Advisory Committee. The presence here tonight of Richard M. Neustadt, Assistant Director of the White House Domestic Policy Staff, Senator Jacob M. Javits of New York, and Representative William D. Ford of Michigan reflects the role of the National Commission as an independent Government agency reporting to both the President and to the Congress. We will hear first from Rick Neustadt, whose responsibilities at the White House include information and communications policy and regulatory reform.

Remarks of Richard M. Neustadt

MR. NEUSTADT: As someone who works on information policy day to day, I'm thrilled that you're here. I know its been a long wait, but your timing is spectacular. We're at a transition point. We've worked through most of the information agenda of the 1980's on privacy, patents, communications regulation, freedom of information, and the need to bring education to the Cabinet table. All those issues have been debated and the directions are clear. Now it's time to frame the agenda for the next decade.

This is going to be a decade of limits, and of hard choices, but information is a field of hope and opportunity. Information can improve our productivity. Books consume no oil; there are no limits on knowledge. In the next three days, you are going to play a vital role in framing the new agenda. You can help us structure the new Department of Education. You can point to new directions, through the Government's library programs. You can help the information institutions in each community to share facilities and take advantage of the new information technologies. You can help define the information roles of the public and private sectors. You can launch projects to strengthen America's economy, and enrich Americans' lives.

Now those ends are magnificent. The means to realize them, as you know, are limited. And the time to set priorities is short. You are going to have a long, hard weekend. But it's worth it. I plan to be with you, and others from the White House will be with you through most of that time, and we're really looking forward to every minute.

This is a White House Conference and I'm from the White House, so I'd like to propose a toast. This is to Charles Benton, Bessie Moore, and Marilyn Gell. Those of us who watched them through the last few very hard months must have wondered with you whether we'd ever all see this night. We owe you, all of us, a debt of gratitude. Congratulations.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: We wish to thank our next speaker, the Honorable William Ford, for his strong leadership in making possible the passage of legislation essential to the improvement of library and information services in public and school libraries and for libraries and institutions offering post-secondary education. We also commend him for his successful efforts in the passage of postal legislation favorable to libraries, and his continuing interest and support of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, as well as his participation as a member of the Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Remarks of Representative William Ford

REPRESENTATIVE FORD: Thank you very much. It's a real pleasure to be here this evening and share the feeling of enthusiasm that was brought to me by the Michigan delegation when they came to my office today to share some of their thoughts. I can warn the rest of you that they have some great ideas, and if they are in any way typical of the kind of enthusiasm that is gathered here, this is going to be a very busy weekend indeed.

I'm informed that there are only about 3,000 resolutions introduced at this point, but that it is expected that if my friend Judge Abner Mikva manages to get you through the rules well enough tonight, and holds off any kind of a gag rule, you'll still have time to get a few thousand more in before tomorrow just to fill in any of the spare time that might have been left this weekend. That's an ambitious number, isn't it?

Senator Javits and I, as members of the Advisory Committee, have been watching with great interest the very positive kinds of reactions that have been coming from all across this country as you people have been preparing to come to this Conference. You've heard from the people tonight who talked about how many years and how much effort it took to finally reach the reality of a White House Conference. I'm sure that some of you are wondering, as certainly we wondered when we came to this town to sit in the Congress, exactly what we were doing here and what people were expecting of us. The very least that I hope you will remember this weekend is that we're hoping that a much larger part of the American public than you might possibly imagine are watching, and will be listening and watching in the future for the signs of progress that you point out to us. Not only, as Senator Pell has said, for Federal policy, but for an understanding of where that Federal policy will mesh with the efforts of other traditional supporters of libraries and information science.

We are struggling at the turn of the decade to look forward, since change is overtaking us very rapidly. When long-standing traditions of support for our most important institutions are breaking away, and support that was taken for granted just a short time ago, as Mayor Barry said, is drying up, we're very much concerned about what the role of the Federal Government is going to be, in partnership with public and private resources all over this country. We want to make sure that we don't lose track of the tremendous growth of information available not only to Americans but to all of the world. My good friend John Brademas equated the open doors of our libraries with the open society that we're proud to boast about throughout the world. As usual, it's an accurate statement that is in no way an exaggeration.

But those of us here from Congress know full well that when you have a lot of suggestions put together for us to examine, one of the toughest arm-twisting lobbyists that I've met down here is going to be coming around to gently, quietly, and firmly and effectively convince us that you were right. American Library Association has been represented by a gentlelady over to my left, Eileen Cooke, since I've been down here. I hesitate to introduce her to my constituents, because I like them to believe that I'm under pressure from really mean, tough, big husky brutes down here, and they go away with the mistaken impression that lobbyists are nice and gentle and thoughtful. She's all of those things; but I'm sure that if you took a poll of the Members of Congress with whom she communicates, they would all agree with me that you're very well represented in the halls of Congress.

We're looking forward, as Senator Pell said, to your guidance and counsel, although there is no guarantee that because we voted to create this Conference we're going to pay any attention to you at all. That depends on whether or not you can provide us with a rationale for the 1980's and 1990's that will make solid sense to the American people and to their representatives in the White House and in the Congress, who have the responsibility of rationing out scarce dollars.

I'm sure you'll hear during the weekend that if we spent just as much money on your projects as we did on defense, that would solve everything. When we ask for resources for education in any form and for libraries and library activities, we're not competing with the Pentagon, we're competing with cancer research, with the cleaning up of our waterways, with the building of highways and mass transit, with every other legitimate claim that can be made on the Federal Treasury. And while I'm sure that you know that it's getting tougher and tougher to compete for those dollars, we have been doing rather well in forwarding the role of the Federal Government as a full partner in the support of education, and all of those things that are necessary to support our pluralistic educational system in this country.

Obviously you cannot predict our success in funding the great ideas that will somehow be born and polished and refined here; that's our job afterwards. But it's also your job. I agree with what the Mayor said to you. You've already become involved, as Senator Pell also indicated, in the political process because that's how you got here. If you still entertain the idea that you can participate in anything as important as this activity and then bow out in graceful retirement when you leave here, I wish you'd leave now and let one of the alternates take your place. Because we're counting on you're not only sitting here and exercising your wisdom in the democratic process that will lead you towards solutions and suggestions of future projects to undertake. We hope that you will be the voice of this Conference to the American people, and make it possible for all of us to face our constituents and say, "The expenditure of your money, taxpayers, for the White House Conference will come back to you and to generations to come, many, many times, because these people did the kind of a great job that we expected of them."

We wish you good luck, of course, and we look forward with real anticipation to the contribution we know that this Conference is going to make. You will never again, perhaps, in the lifetime of the people in this room, have a platform such as the platform from which you will be speaking in the Conference to talk to the American people about one of the most important concerns in any civilized society. I hope and trust that this Conference will recognize the seriousness of that challenge and make us all proud to be a part of it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Thank you very much, Bill. Senator Javits, we wish to recognize your untiring efforts and support of library legislation for over 20 years, not the least of which is the National Library Act which you put forward along with Senator Kennedy as the Study Bill for this Conference. We also wish to recognize your participation in the legislation process making possible this Conference and your active participation as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Conference, as well as your sponsorship of legislation creating the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. We're very glad to have you with us.

Remarks of Senator Jacob K. Javits

SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you very much, Charles Benton, and congratulations to Bessie Moore and to Marilyn Gell. It's a great joy to be here with my colleagues who have also helped in this field. I think every one of the speeches made to you tonight is extremely important and deserves the respect of this Conference. For ourselves in New York, we have a great delegation down here in the Conference, led by our education commissioner, Gordon Ambach, by a member of our Board of Regents, Laura Chodos, by one of our State Senators, Hugh Farley, and by a man who wrote a book on this subject, Whitney North Seymour, Jr., popularly known to us as Mike Seymour. So we are taking this very, very seriously in New York.

I will not undertake to repeat anything that has been said tonight; I have a thought of my own which I'd like to leave with you. First, I thank you very much for this award, it's very gracious, and it will be prized and treasured because I'm a product of libraries. My library was on Rivington Street on the lower east side of New York. It was a corollary to my public school which was half a block away. I went home every evening with arms full of books. I wondered as a young person if I would ever read them all, but I did, and I believe that they contributed enormously to my education. Even more important, to me the library was a cathedral of the mind; it was so much more pleasant than any of my home surroundings, although my parents loved each other and home was very warm and dear. But home could never duplicate the marvelous horizons, the wonderful visions of other worlds, other lives, other minds, other thoughts, other optimisms that the library meant to me. I have said of my native city, New York City, that there's a new adventure around every corner; I felt that way about its libraries, too.

Now, I would like to just take the counterpart, the other side of the coin, that the Mayor of Washington took. You're urged to get politically oriented. As Claiborne Pell properly said, you are at the beginning, and, as my colleague Bill Ford emphasized, this is a take-off point, not a landing. But the Federal Government, I must tell you, will never do for you what you need to have done. What you can do with the Federal Government is to make it a secure source of support that will aid and assist in everything you want to do.

This Conference ought to be a staging area for all of you. That's a military term for the place where you get ready for a big campaign. You need to get ready because our support is level now and there's grave danger of more cuts next year. We'll fight them all just as we have before, and we'll do a good job. But in the final analysis it's success that gets Federal money and it's success that gets public attention. So I hope very much that you will use this Conference to draw upon each other's experiences and try to take home to your communities the very best that's been done, in order to aggrandize the library situation in your area or your State or community.

Remember, States and municipalities, counties, villages and towns are political entities too, with voters, and their public officials have to appeal for the support of those voters. Also, landlords have buildings and stores that are often empty, and people like recreation and entertainment. Have you tried readings, have you tried recordings, have you tried community meetings? If you're excited about libraries as I am and all of us here are, what about your community? Has it been inducted into the fantastic panoply of man's thought, man's history, the individual lives of men, man's art, man's science and invention, and the fantastic story of human achievement which is within your libraries. And then, lots of people have books, whole libraries of books, great books; they leave many of these things to museums or to their relatives; what are they leaving to you?

All of this is an enormous well you can tap, because the library is very attractive, very appealing, very sympathetic. Then there are all those young people who can ring doorbells. I know, I've waged successful campaigns with lots of high school students, as have my colleagues. In any case, please think of being resourceful and using everything you can and I predict that as you are successful in this whole library effort the Federal Government will come through better, as will all other levels of government.

Witness the National Endowment on the Arts (NEA), and the National Endowment on the Humanities (NEH). I have the great honor, with Claiborne and John Brademas and others, to be a founder of NEA, which has grown enormously in Federal appropriations, as has NEH, which is essentially Claiborne Pell's invention.

Now, your Chairman suggested that Ted Kennedy and I introduced the National Library Act as a document for study. Yes, it is a text, and I hope that you will study it and that we may have your views, for the success of this living organism will come from your brilliance and imagination, your indefatigible dedication to making it of tremendous use to your community. If people don't come to your library, don't blame it on them, blame it on yourself, just as we do when we fail to attract the voter. If you're doing things right, that library ought to be a magnet in your community, a place to which people love to go. They'll be begging you to keep it open day and night, including Saturdays and Sundays. That's your test.

We've put out to bring you here, now you put out to bring home to us the only reward we want, a fantastic increase in those who attend libraries, those who profit from them, and a vast increase in the resources of libraries. I must tell you in all frankness that the American library is getting almost as obsolescent as the American industrial machine. There's an enormous amount to be done. It's a joy to do it with you as we have tried; now it's very much up to you, and I hope you will go away from here with the inspiration, the drive, the ideas, and, beyond everything else, the understanding of the critical importance of the national purpose in which you are engaged.

We're all self-starters, and you've got to be, too. The genius of this society is that we don't need commissars to tell us to go read in the library. You just make it vivid enough and exciting enough to the individual in the American town, city, village and county, and they'll innundate you. That's our objective. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Senator Javits, that's an inspiring note on which to end the speeches and awards. We will now adjourn for 15 minutes, and reconvene for the adoption of the rules.

Participants

Abner J. Mikva
Moderator

Edmund Reggie
Moderator

Margaret Warden
Rules Committee

Simon Newman
Parliamentarian

John Stackpole
Parliamentarian

Adoption of Rules

Thursday, November 15, 1979

Proceedings

CHAIRMAN BENTON: A conference of this magnitude without rules is like a body without bones. It would collapse of its own weight. The rules are the laws by which we will live over the next four days. They will govern the procedures of the Conference and the format of the results. I urge you all to give your utmost attention to this very important first general session of this Conference. This is your Conference, and, in accordance with our democratic process, you will decide the rules that govern it.

We have two splendid moderators for this session, Judge Abner Mikva of the United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, and Mr. Edmund Reggie, Executive Counsel to the Governor of Louisiana, Edwin W. Edwards.

Both of these men are jurists and lawyers with impeccable credentials and national reputations. We have reached out to them because they care deeply about the reasons we are gathered here.

I have known Abner Mikva for over 20 years. He ably represented the congressional district where I lived, the Tenth Congressional District of Illinois, from 1968 until September of this year, when he took the oath of office in his present position. Ab has a superb legislative record and a keen knowledge of one of the major issues that will concern us during this Conference, the question of the individual's rights to privacy versus the public's right to access to information. He gained this expertise during his service on the American Bar Association's National Commission on Individual Rights and Privacy. I turned to Ab for his special role in our Conference because I felt we needed him. I am delighted he is here.

I had not met Mr. Edmund Reggie personally until tonight, but I have heard of his high reputation as jurist and moderator. His qualities were very much in evidence when he served as moderator of the Louisiana Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services in September 1978.

Mr. Reggie has a long record of public service to both the people of Louisiana and of the Nation. Eighteen years ago he served as President John F. Kennedy's special envoy to the Middle East to inquire, among other matters, into the Palestinian refugee problem.

Closer to home, he has also served as Director of Extension and Continuing Education to the State of Louisiana and has a special knowledge of issues concerned with one of the major themes of this conference, library and information services for lifelong learning—which, incidentally, happens to be the favorite theme of the Conference as judged by the choices of the delegates. Mr. Reggie, we thank you for your presence at this Conference.

JUDGE MIKVA: Welcome, all of you. I think that my main credential for being here is that I have survived five terms in the Illinois State Legislature, which is oft known as the last vestige of democracy in the raw. I think that Charles felt that if I could survive that, certainly I could survive a group of distinguished Americans who are here talking about a subject that we all hold dear.

I just have to think how excited you all must be to be involved in an opportunity to take one of the best institutions in our society and *not* save it from ruination. You're not here on some big bail-out operation, and not in terms of providing a proper interment for an institution that is dead, but rather for an institution that is very vital and very alive, and, as was said so much more eloquently tonight, it needs some new directions and new agenda. But for the rest of your lives and for your children's lives, you will remember that at this one gathering of many hundreds of people there was a new set of inputs into how to make the library system and information system even better than it has ever been. Since it is the measuring stick both of our freedom and of our growth, it's got to be an exciting opportunity.

Well, so much for the opportunity. With the opportunity goes the responsibility. And the responsibility for tonight is how you fashion a set of working rules that will permit you to enjoy the greatest participation in a proceeding which will give you the greatest latitude for making these important determinations and come out with a product. The great tragedy of all would be if all this talent were to be here for four days and so convolute yourselves, for whatever reasons, that the product is not there.

I have no doubt that it will be a successful Conference, but the rules are to help you get there and that's what we are here about.

Let me give you just a very brief statement about where we are as we come in here tonight, so you will understand what the task is at hand.

First of all, I hope you all have in your kits a document which is dated "Draft, November 13, 1979, Part I, General, White House Conference on Library and Information Services, Proposed Rules."

We will start doing it by sections. Let me assure you that this is not a brand new document, the likes of which you never saw before. Back on September 13th, the very first set of proposed rules was mailed out to all of you, and to your brothers and sisters, and uncles and aunts, and anybody else who had ever looked at a library book. They were also in the *Federal Register* at that time. An effort was made to get these as widely circulated as possible and get input from people who were expected to be delegates to this Conference:

A substantial number of you put in your suggestions and comments for changes, and on October 12th, a second set of proposed rules was sent to you, which incorporated all of the recommendations that had been put forward by various people. That document and this document are very, very similar as far as rules are concerned. In fact, the only changes between the October 12th document, which you had an opportunity to review, I hope, and this one, which you may not have seen until today, are some technical changes, and a change in the credential system as far as the seating of alternate delegates.

If you will look around this room, you will understand that the logistics of this Conference are going to be one of the great miracles of our time. In order to make sure that the logistics work, there has been a proposed change in the credential system so that if it is desirable as far as a State delegation is concerned for an alternate to take the place of a regular delegate: 1) that replacement is a permanent thing; and 2) it has to be certified by the head of the State delegation so that on each day, at the beginning of the day, you will all know who the voting delegates are, and that those will be the delegates for the rest of the Conference.

That voting machine in your hand is very simple, but like all simple things it needs a little bit of interpretation. There's a word on it that says "abstain." That position on the voting machine is to clear the machine. Before a vote starts, each of you who are voting delegates should put your machine on "abstain" so that it is cleared. Then, as you note, there are three letter positions on the machine, A, which is yes; B, which is no; and C, which is abstain.

It is important that before we start a vote that you do clear your machine because it will be the only way we will be able to really know how many people are abstaining, whether a quorum is present, etc. There will be a tabulation of the vote going on electronically. I believe it will be projected, and you will know quickly. Indeed, it will be the only way that we can possibly get a real understanding of what is the consensus of opinion amongst this large a group.

This ties into the next housekeeping rule I was going to mention. All of these proceedings are being taped. This is a public gathering in the highest sense. Everything we all say is a matter of record, a matter of historic moment. Therefore, the moderators are going to have to insist that when you seek the floor you must go to one of the positions where there is a microphone and identify yourself by name and by delegation and present your business to the body.

Let me at this point introduce the other people who are on the panel with me. Margaret Warden is a distinguished member of the

White House Conference Advisory Committee and has served as chairman of the Rules Committee. She is a former State senator from the State of Montana. She will be my main source of information and inspiration if the questions get harder.

You've already met Edmund Reggie, who will serve as my co-moderator. I would like to also make sure you know who Mr. Newman and Mr. Stackpole are. Mr. Simon Newman, sitting immediately to my left; he is the parliamentarian. To his left is Mr. John Stackpole, who will be one of the assistant parliamentarians.

Now let me talk about the document that is before you. It is at this point sheets of paper, with no vitality other than what you give it, because until this body acts, there can be no rules. We will operate temporarily by Robert's Rules in terms of understanding how people get the floor and what are the main motions and so on. But Robert's Rules are not the way to run a conference. These rules or whatever variations you put on them obviously are going to be the ground rules by which the Conference is run.

There are a couple of things that I think I ought to comment on. First, there is a provision that talks about a two-thirds vote to change any of the rules. Since there are no rules at this point, I have construed that two-thirds to talk about changes in the rules after they are adopted. I think that, unless someone has strong objection and proposes a change, which they can do, it seems to me that the only way to adopt rules in a democratic forum is to allow whatever amendments are sought to be made by a majority vote, which is the traditional way by which rules are adopted. Once those rules are fixed, it seems to me it is reasonable and proper, which is what the proposal suggests, that from there on it may not be changed except by two-thirds vote, and that too is subject to your amendment tonight. But I wanted you to understand that as far as I was concerned, I was going to rule that any amendments that carried by a majority vote would be accepted as amendments to these rules, and only after they were adopted would it require a two-thirds vote if there was to be a change.

I am also prepared, and here I guess I'm going to need unanimous consent—that's a great phrase that we use in the Congress and most legislative bodies when something absolutely needs doing, but it would be very complicated to go through the process of doing it. You ask for unanimous consent and hope that everybody understands how absolutely imperative it is that it needs doing.

There is in these proposed rules a requirement that all proposed changes in the rules be submitted at least five hours before they are to be acted upon. I would suggest, and would hope that this would be by unanimous consent, that that rule be construed to mean that those of you who have serious amendments that you have spent time on in your State delegations and were courteous enough to have provided copies of them early on, those have been duplicated and copies are available to be considered. But if other amendments come up tonight for whatever reasons, they will be put on transparencies and will be put on the screen so that everyone can see what is the proposed amendment. I do not intend to observe or enforce the five-hour rule, unless you as the plenary body overrule that suggestion, because it just seems to me unreasonable to gag this body by any kind of rule like that, and, again, I don't think that was the intention. I think it was the assumption that there was a break between the time you got the kits and the time this rule session started.

With those interpretations, I would think that the proposed rules as set forth on the draft, dated November 13, 1979, ought to be put before this body. I would entertain a motion from one of the delegates to put those rules before the body, and then would rule that the rules are open for amendment at any place by any delegate. Is there such a motion from the floor?

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, John Rice from Louisiana. I move the adoption of the proposed rules.

JUDGE MIKVA: You have heard the motion. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. MOORE: Ivory Moore from Texas. I second the motion.

JUDGE MIKVA: You have heard the motion and the second. That motion is now the pending business before the body. Amendments are in order to that motion. I would propose that all amendments be voted on as they come up; and when all amendments have been considered by this body, we will then revert to the main motion, which will be the motion to adopt the rules with whatever amendments have been adopted. Are there amendments?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, my name is Boyd Wright, chairman of the North Dakota delegation, and I would like to move a substitute motion that we work from the draft of the rules dated October 12th. If you will notice, the several proposed amendments that have been distributed to you tonight all were drafted based on the rules that we've been looking at for the last month. I don't think it's fair to try and amend a set of rules that we just saw in the last 15 or 20 minutes and have not had a chance to make a comparison.

So, I would make a substitute motion that we adopt the rules dated October 12th and use that as the basis for the consideration of these amendments which were put in within the five-hour time limit.

JUDGE MIKVA: The substitute is clearly in order. Let me say, before you decide how you want to vote on this, that in terms of any technical changes that would be required because of different wording or different sectioning or so on, we would conform the amendments that were made on an earlier date to this draft.

So, if it is purely for technical reasons, that I think we could accommodate. But, again, it is up to this body to decide which set of rules they desire to work from or which document they desire to work from.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, with that assurance, I would withdraw my substitute motion.

JUDGE MIKVA: The substitute has been withdrawn. Are there substantive amendments to the rules?

MR. RAYNOLDS: Some of the delegates, I believe, have in their hands now a sheet of amendments headed by a page entitled "Analysis." The top group of pages, the first five, relate to amendments put together by the Steering Committee of the western caucus. There are other amendments in this same sheet, many of which I personally would agree with, but I do not move them, because they are not my motion. I would like to speak, if I could, to motions contained in the first five pages headed by a sheet entitled "Analysis," and I wonder if enough delegates have the paper before them.

A PARTICIPANT: I call a point of order on the gentleman. Judge Mikva ruled that we would take the amendments up one at a time, and I think if we're going to, we may as well do that. We do not have copies of his.

JUDGE MIKVA: I have not ruled on it, and, again, if a sponsor of the motion proposes to consider them in block, that would be in order, unless the delegates prefer to consider them separately. But it is important that you have this document before you. I think that Mr. Raynolds provided the staff with the material so that we should have enough copies for the delegates. I would ask Mr. Raynolds to suspend for a moment or two until copies are given.

So you will understand, the five-hour rule wasn't proposed as some kind of a gag rule. There is a problem when you deal with a body like this, which is coming together for the first time, on how do we make sure people know what it is they are being asked to do. And yet, at the same time, how do we get on with the business of the Conference? We clearly didn't come here to spend four days arguing about the rules, and it's this kind of combination that has to go out.

(Applause.)

Mr. Raynolds, you are recognized.

MR. RAYNOLDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE MIKVA: Due to the size of the room and the number of people, we simply cannot act as informally as we otherwise might want. Any comments addressed to the body must be addressed by a delegate who identifies himself from one of the stations where a microphone is present. Otherwise, we will be in chaos long before our time.

MR. RAYNOLDS: May I yield to the question from the floor?

JUDGE MIKVA: You certainly may.

MR. STEELMAN: I'm Don Steelman, a delegate from Texas. Would the distinguished delegate from Wyoming be willing to consider his proposals amendment by amendment? I think these are of such an earth-shattering nature that that might be the only way in which we could really give them the consideration which they deserve.

MR. RAYNOLDS: I think I would prefer, if possible, to consider them either in block or in three groups, since they have been put into three categories: four amendments to expedite business, which fit together; five amendments to increase delegate participation, which fit together; and, finally, there are ten which really look like small little details but gets us closer back towards Robert's Rules of Order, and those relate to orderly procedures.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman continues to be recognized. it his request to have them considered in block, or the first four in block?

MR. RAYNOLDS: I would prefer to consider them in block, if that's agreeable to the meeting, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE MIKVA: We will proceed on that basis.

MR. RAYNOLDS: Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, I would propose that, rather than read the full text aloud, I be permitted merely to read the preparatory analysis and then by reference have discussion of the amendments.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman is recognized for that purpose.

MR. RAYNOLDS: Sir, the analysis is as follows; and I repeat, this refers only to the first group on the first five pages: "The attached amendments are designed to ensure delegate control of this Conference, speed up the workflow, and produce significant results. The goals of our Conference appear to be: A) produce resolutions which specify needed national legislation and regulations; B) develop resolutions which would encourage needed legislation at the State level; C) develop resolutions to improve library personnel and enhance public participation in library services.

"These amendments remove limitations on the number of resolutions, but retain the concept of priorities. They make possible the revised time schedule on page five, which includes time for State caucuses.

"The first four amendments are designed to expedite business through the creation of three mini-plenary sessions to channel resolutions directly toward the Conference goals." That would be the national legislation at the State and local level.

"The effect of these proposals is illustrated on the flowchart on page five. The next five amendments permit increased delegate participation in key functions. The final ten amendments relate to orderly procedures for our Conference.

"Thank you for your courtesy in studying these proposed amendments."

I would now hope for a second, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE MIKVA: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. WRIGHT: Boyd Wright, chairman of the North Dakota delegation. I will second that motion.

JUDGE MIKVA: The motion has been moved and seconded that the proposals that are before you in this document entitled "Analysis," consisting of a series of 19 separate amendments, be made to the proposed rules. That motion is now before the delegates. Is there discussion of that motion?

MR. KING: Just a point of information, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman is recognized at station four.

MR. KING: Bill King, from Alabama. Will the Chair rule, can this be redone in the manner that has been suggested?

JUDGE MIKVA: Let me say again that the rules for this Conference are absolutely up to the people who are in this room, who are voting delegates. There is no preordained set of rules that must be adopted. There's nothing in the statute that requires any specific rules to be adopted. If the question is: Legally, can they be adopted? The answer is: They are within the jurisdiction of this body. There are, obviously, some other questions that I think are contained in your question, which I assume will be discussed by the delegates and by the staff. I would call on anybody who has any information on this, dealing with some physical problems or with some arrangements problems which may be affected by the changes, but that is, again, for the delegates to decide.

MR. KING: The reason here, Mr. Chairman, is that as of now we have absolutely no rules, right?

JUDGE MIKVA: That is correct.

MR. KING: So the direction is primarily in your hands, am I not to suggest?

JUDGE MIKVA: No, no. What is before the house is a proposed set of rules by a motion made by the gentleman from Louisiana, and there is now before the house an amendment to that proposed set of rules. Both of those are properly before the house. The amendment is up to the people in this room. May I recognize the woman at station three?

MR. KING: Well, I move that we consider these item by item then.

JUDGE MIKVA: My parliamentarian advises me that that is an appropriate motion. It is a motion in the nature of seeking a division. Once again, that is up to this body, and that is not debatable. That will come to an immediate vote. The gentleman has moved that the question be divided, which means that we will take up every one of the 19 amendments here seriatim, one by one. That is the question before the house—not the adoption of the amendments, but whether or not we should consider them all at once, or one at a time.

A PARTICIPANT: Point of information. Has there been a second to it?

MR. STEELMAN: Mr. Chairman, I second the motion.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman from Texas seconds the motion. The motion is properly before the house. Let me again repeat what the business before the house is so that you can be prepared to vote. First of all, is our voting apparatus in order and ready to go? We are about to test it. Will everybody, first of all, clear their machines by putting them through "Abstain"?

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman?

JUDGE MIKVA: We are in the middle of a vote. What is the gentleman's purpose of speaking?

THE PARTICIPANT: I move that the vote on this matter be delayed for five minutes for the purpose of discussing with the membership the amendments. We'll be here all night to vote on all these amendments.

JUDGE MIKVA: The question is not debatable.

THE PARTICIPANT: I made a subsequent motion to delay the vote.

JUDGE MIKVA: The only way that can occur is that the gentleman who has moved for a division and the seconder will seek to withdraw that motion. Let me also say to you, though, that if it is defeated, it can be renewed again at a future time.

We are now on the vote. No further discussion is in order. If you are in favor of discussing all of these amendments at once and voting on them all at once, you will vote no, and that is the B position. If you are in favor of voting on them one at a time and discussing them one at a time, you will vote yes, and that is the A position. If you have no expression you care to make, you will vote C, and that is the abstain position. The delegates will now proceed to vote.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Again, we still do not have any rules. The Chair is going to adopt again, unless somebody strongly objects, an arbitrary three minute time limit for the voting. Let's modify that. Let's make it one minute. I think one minute ought to be enough time. So the machines will be open for one minute and then the vote will be taken in final.

Has everyone voted who wished? We declare the votes finalized. Those voting yes in favor of the motion to divide are 70; those voting no are 352; and those abstaining are 6, and the motion to divide is not agreed to.

The business before the house is the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming.

MS. SLOCUM: Mr. Chairman, I thought I was recognized.

JUDGE MIKVA: Excuse me. Somebody is at station one.

MS. SLOCUM: I was recognized earlier.

JUDGE MIKVA: The woman's point is well taken. She was recognized before the vote was before the house.

MS. SLOCUM: Thank you. Grace Slocum from Maryland. The last vote means that I do not have to get up 19 times and speak against this amendment. I spent considerable time before I came to this Conference figuring out what was going to happen when and how it would work. I don't see that the suggestions put forth are any improvement, but, rather, a confusion. I speak against any of these amendments that would change the structure of this Conference at this late date.

JUDGE MIKVA: Station one.

MS. MOORE: I am Elizabeth Moore from Michigan. I rise for a point of information. What effect would the change make upon the program, the orders and arrangements of different sessions?

JUDGE MIKVA: I think I'm going to ask Ms. Warden, who has served as chairman of the Rules Committee, to comment on what the changes would be in the logistics of the program.

MS. WARDEN: I would just like to preface my remarks with the fact that we worked for about two years on the planning of this. As you notice, the space is very limited in this particular group. We still have luncheons and things that we have to do, and logistically it would be impossible, not just pretty impossible, but completely impossible, to try and rearrange the room structures at this particular time. The hotel facilities are used. They have provided the rooms and that sort of thing, and to completely turn around and put many plenary sessions in there would bring together greater bodies of people rather than the work groups that are scheduled. I would say it's logistically impossible.

JUDGE MIKVA: Station two.

MR. SHER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Michael Sher. I'm a delegate-at-large. I would like to speak against this motion and against the amendment because I feel it's generally nit-picking and a stalling tactic. It's keeping us from our real work, which is a discussion of the institution of the libraries in this country. I ask that everyone vote against this amendment.

(Applause.)

MR. MORENO: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized.

JUDGE MIKVA: Station four.

MR. MORENO: Gordon Moreno from California. I think that we should take into consideration that we, the delegates that are representing the people of our communities, have to deal with this thing no matter what has been done by the staff or whoever is on top of this. We have to approve what we want to approve, not what somebody else wants to tell us, and I think Dave has come up with something that is really relevant to what we're all about.

If we want to change things throughout the country, we have to get together on something that's factual. As you know, the rules have been changed; the times of the meetings were changed; everything has been changed, and if we have something relevant that we can work on, it shouldn't take us long. We're people, we're intelligent, and we have given our time for the last three years, and some of us more, to come to something conclusive. So, let's do it. If we aren't going to do it enough, let's get the hell out of here if we're not going to work.

JUDGE MIKVA: The woman at station one.

MS. POTTER: Hazel Potter, delegate from Nevada. I would like to go on record as being against this. I am a member of the western caucus and this does not reflect the consensus of the western caucus. I would like to move the question.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: The question has been moved. Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

JUDGE MIKVA: It has been seconded. At this point, the question before the house is whether to cut off debate and vote on the amendment to the main motion. That is what moving the question involves. Therefore, the first vote will be whether or not you further want to debate this amendment. If you do further want to debate this amendment, you will vote no, B on the machine. If you feel that you have heard enough about this amendment and are prepared to vote, you will vote to cut off debate and vote A, yes on the machine. If you have no view on whether or not to cut off further debate, you may abstain by voting C.

Will everybody please clear their machines? Those in favor of the previous question, cutting off further debate, will vote A; those opposed will vote B; and the voting machines are open. They will remain open for one minute.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

The machines are closed. The vote is 413 in favor of the previous question; 41 against; 3 abstain. The previous question has been ordered.

We will now immediately vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. Raynolds. Those in favor of the amendment, which consists of the block set of 19 amendments to the proposed rule, will vote aye, the A position. Those opposed to Mr. Raynolds' amendment will vote B, the no position. Those who have no view will vote C.

Will everybody please clear their machines? Once again, those in favor of the amendment to the rules will vote aye by voting A; those opposed will vote no by voting B; and the abstainers will vote C. The machines are open. No one is recognized and the previous question has been ordered.

A PARTICIPANT: Point of personal privilege.

JUDGE MIKVA: You will have to wait until the vote is over, and I will then recognize you. The machines are open. You have one minute to vote.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Those people whose machines are not working, please raise your hand.

(A showing of hands.)

The time is up. Those in favor of the amendment are 52; opposed are 397; abstaining are 11. The amendment is not agreed to.

(Applause.)

Before I recognize the gentleman from Texas on his point of personal privilege, will the delegates indulge the Chair for just a brief resume of what the various points are. Since it is a big body, it's a late hour, and there's a lot of work to do and you have four days to reform the entire reading system of this country, I hope that future Chairs will observe these same restrictions.

A point of order is a point objecting to the proceedings that are then before the house. It's a very technical point. It isn't a request to speak and it has to pertain to something dealing with the rules or the parliamentary procedures that are before the house. It has to be stated. There is no debate on it and then there is a ruling by the Chair. If you don't like the Chair's ruling, the Chair's ruling can be appealed, but it is not a synonym for seeking the floor.

A point of information, a point of clarification, and a point of personal privilege are all within the discretion of the Chair. There are no such things for all parliamentary purposes, except when the Chair feels that it will help in an orderly proceeding to recognize somebody for that purpose. What that suggests is that it, again, ought not be used as a substitute or a synonym for debate. This Chair and most Chairs are most indulgent about points of information. Obviously, it is important to the people who are being expected to vote on these things to know what they're voting upon. It's the same with a point of clarification.

A point of personal privilege deals with the fact that someone feels he has been abused in some way by the body or by the Chair, and for that purpose, I recognize the gentleman from Texas if he seeks to be recognized. If so, would he take the microphone.

MR. STEELMAN: Mr. Chairman, although the Chair called for a test of the voting machinery, the delegate from Texas did not observe such a test. The delegate from Texas would therefore request that the machines be tested to determine whether or not votes are being recorded properly by the equipment, and would respectfully point to the Chair that he does not believe that this has been done.

JUDGE MIKVA: Without yielding that there is any invalidity to any of the action that has been taken, I want to make sure everybody is satisfied that the device in your hand is in fact a working device. Therefore, I will ask everybody at this point to vote yes. There is nothing before the house except the testing of the machine. Vote yes.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

It's obvious that the machines are correct with about four or five deviations. In light of the fact that none of the votes were at all that close, the Chair is going to rule that the votes are valid.

(Applause.)

That is within the normal error of the machine, we are told. (Laughter.) We knew a long time ago that people are better than machines.

The Chair is going to suggest that when a vote is close, he will entertain a motion to go to an alternate form of voting, which will be very time-consuming and delaying, but obviously if a motion is close we are not going to have it resolved by the vagaries of a machine. So, if there is that close a vote where the one or two percent error rate can make the difference, we will go to a paper ballot vote and discontinue the elective vote on that motion. But since none of the votes heretofore have been that close, there will be no changes.

So that everyone knows, the business again before the house is the main motion made by the gentleman from Louisiana to adopt the proposed rules and that motion is amendable at any place. The woman at station one is recognized.

MS. LAKE: My name is Ms. Marilyn Lake. I'm from Missouri. I would like to ask a point of information and then possibly make a motion. As I understand, the main motion is to adopt the rules as we have been given them. I think it's the November 13th edition. Is it possible to move the question on that with no further amendment?

JUDGE MIKVA: It is possible to move the question.

MS. LAKE: I move the question with no further amendments.

MR. BIGBIE: I second it.

JUDGE MIKVA: The question has been moved. Has there been a formal second by a delegate? Would the delegates identify themselves?

MR. BIGBIE: Justice Bigbie, Alabama.

JUDGE MIKVA: The question has been moved and seconded. Let me state that the Chair has no alternative but to put that question to a vote. It is not debatable. It is up to the delegates to decide whether they have had full discussion on all of the rules or whether they would want to entertain other amendments. If this motion carries, if the previous question carries, we will them immediately proceed to vote on the adoption of the rules.

Let me remind you that it will take a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting to cut off debate. This is unusual parliamentary procedure. It's normal, but it is considered sufficiently unusual so that it requires more than a majority vote.

I regret to say that since the question has been put and seconded, the Chair has no alternative but at this point to put that question to a vote. I will entertain a point of information. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

MR. RAYNOLDS: Point of information, Mr. Chairman. Could you explain to us the effect of the present motion as regards all the other amendments which were duly submitted today?

JUDGE MIKVA: If the motion for the previous question is adopted by two-thirds of the delegates voting here tonight, that will preclude the consideration of any of those other amendments, and we will then immediately go to a vote on the rules as proposed on November 13th. It is in fact, as the gentleman described, a closure motion. If two-thirds of the delegates do not vote to cut off further amendments and debate, we will then proceed for the consideration of the other amendments that people have to offer.

The question before the house is: "Shall debate be cut off, and further amendments be cut off, and shall you proceed to an immediate vote on the rules as recommended?"

Those in favor of cutting off debate and cutting off any further amendments will vote A; those opposed will vote B; those who have no view will vote C. The Chair has ruled that it will take a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting to carry this closure motion. The delegates have one minute in which to vote. Clear your machines first. Put them on "Abstain." Now, the machines are open and you have one minute in which to vote A, yes, cut off debate and further amendments; B, no; or C, abstain.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Has everyone voted who wished? While we get the exact percentage, the Chair will rely on having gotten a very good public school education, augmented by the good public libraries of Milwaukee, and rule that the motion has not carried by a two-thirds vote and further amendments are in order. The gentlewoman at station three.

MS. BEAMAN: Mr. Chairman, Dorothy Beaman from Maryland. I would like to suggest an amendment to rules 4.16.1 and 4.16.2. I would like to recommend that they be amended to submit a total of 34 resolutions to be brought to the final plenary session for each theme area, presenting the same number of resolutions as there are work groups within that theme area.

The rationale for this, of course, is that the delegates were given a choice as to which theme they wanted to be in and since ten workshops are in Theme II, that indicates that that area has the most interest so far as the delegates are concerned. So, if they have the right to bring ten resolutions, this would represent the fair proportion of the interest. And, of course, the theme areas with smaller number of workshops then would have a smaller number of resolutions to be brought forth.

JUDGE MIKVA: I would ask the gentlewoman if she would put a copy of her motion on one of these slips so that we can see it.

A PARTICIPANT: We already have it.

MS. WILLIAMS: I second the motion. Mary Williams from Virginia.

JUDGE MIKVA: That motion has been made and seconded. Is there discussion on the amendment?

A PARTICIPANT: Point of information.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentlewoman at station four.

THE PARTICIPANT: Would you please explain two-thirds to us? Is it members present and voting or two-thirds of the delegate assembly?

JUDGE MIKVA: Two-thirds of the members present and voting, at least until you adopt rules to the contrary. Is there discussion of the amendment? Are you ready for a vote? All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

JUDGE MIKVA: Before we do that, the reason I'm suggesting a voice vote here is I have heard no contrary discussion. If I am in doubt, we will go to the electric machines. All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The Chair is in doubt. We will use the electric machine. All those in favor of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland will vote yes. First of all, clear your machine.

(So doing.)

I asked if there was further discussion. I do not want to develop the reputation of a fast gavel, which is something like a hanging judge, so I will ask you for a vote.

A PARTICIPANT: Repeat the motion.

JUDGE MIKVA: While the gentlewoman is proceeding to one of the stations, could we have a rereading of the motion so that everybody knows which one it is and exactly what it does.

MS. BEAMAN: It's on the next to the last page of the package that you received and the recommendation is that rules 4.16.1 and 4.16.2 be amended to permit a total of 34 resolutions to be brought to the final plenary session, with each theme area presenting the same number of resolutions as there are work groups within that theme area. And, as you know, there are 34 workshops.

JUDGE MIKVA: That would change the potential number of resolutions from what to what?

MS. BEAMAN: It would change it from 25 to 34.

JUDGE MIKVA: So it would permit an additional nine resolutions to be presented. The gentleman is recognized at station three for discussion of this amendment.

MR. McADAMS: Linnie McAdams, delegate from Texas. I rise to oppose this rule change. I do not believe that the particular sessions necessarily demand a given number of resolutions. I think we handicap ourselves unnecessarily by requiring that any particular work group come back with a specified number of resolutions. I think we can best do that by what we believe that particular topic demands and not be hampered by a particular number.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman at station two.

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, John Rice from Louisiana. First of all, a point of information and then a comment. Would you please inform the delegates exactly how many work groups there are for each one of the themes? We do not know that to begin with, and then I would like to make a comment.

MS. WARDEN: We have an answer to that point of information. The first theme group has nine work groups: ten for number two; four for number three; seven for number four; and four for number five.

JUDGE MIKVA: A total of 34.

MS. WARDEN: If you were to take resolutions from the different theme groups, that is what the figure is.

MR. RICE: And now my comment, Mr. Chairman. I would like, through the Chair, to ask the delegate making this particular motion to clarify for us that we are seeking a given number of resolutions from each one of these theme sessions, and not guaranteeing that necessarily there will be one resolution coming to the floor from each work group. The comment seemed to suggest that before, and I think that needs clarification.

JUDGE MIKVA: Would the gentlewoman from Maryland care to state whether that was the intent of her motion?

MS. BEAMAN: It would be one of the greatest shocks of my life if the various workshops came up with any less than 25 or 30 resolutions. What I am suggesting is that the number to be voted upon at the plenary session be limited to 34 and in proportion to the interest shown—as opposed to the rules which call for five from each theme group. So there would be 25, but they would be equally allocated between the theme areas.

JUDGE MIKVA: But is it correct that any individual theme group could decide whether to take one from each one of its groups, or two from the single group, or three from the single group? That would be up to the theme group?

MS. BEAMAN: Sure. Absolutely.

JUDGE MIKVA: Does that answer the gentleman's question?

MR. RICE: Yes.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman from Illinois.

MR. WRIGHT: Don Wright, delegate from Illinois. The Illinois caucus considered this resolution this afternoon and supports it, because we do understand that there is a need to have a different number from the various theme sessions and that there will be an opportunity to vote on those nonpriority resolutions at a different stage during the Conference.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman at station three.

MR. FOLSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'm Henry Folsom, chairman of the Delaware delegation. We also have the same objections to numbers that were mentioned a while ago. On the fourth from the last sheet of the amendments, we have a suggested amendment which would eliminate all numbers and leave a more flexible position in 14.16.1.

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chair is going to suggest that in order to maintain an orderly procedure, so that we know exactly what we are voting on, if you are proposing this as an amendment to the amendment, it is in order. But then we would ask you to write it down so that we know exactly what it is. If you prefer, the Chair would entertain it as a separate amendment, depending on what happens to this amendment.

MR. FOLSOM: Well, rather than present it is an amendment to the amendment, I agree with you.

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chair will recognize you for purposes of offering an amendment if you so desire after this amendment is disposed of.

MR. FOLSOM: I'm asking the maker of the motion if she would consider eliminating any numbers from her motion.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentlewoman declines to accept the amendment. The gentleman at station four.

MR. KING: Bill King from Alabama. Is the person from Maryland saying that we can only vote on a certain number of things coming out of each theme group? Is that in the rule?

JUDGE MIKVA: That is currently in the rule, sections 4.16.1 and 4.16.2. These deal only with the priority items. Every resolution coming out of every theme group will be voted on.

MR. KING: I move for the question then.

JUDGE MIKVA: The question has been moved. Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

JUDGE MIKVA: The question has been moved and seconded on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland. At this point we are going to have to dispose of that motion for the previous question, before anyone else can be recognized. That always cuts off debate. Will everyone please clear their machines? Those in favor of calling the previous question on the amendment from the gentlewoman from Maryland will vote A, yes; those opposed will vote no, B; those abstaining will vote C. I will remind you that it will take a two-thirds vote to close off debate. This is to cut off debate. It is not to vote on the amendment itself. You have one minute to record your vote.

147

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Have all voted who wish? The vote is closed and the results on the previous question are: in favor of it, 393; opposed, 8; abstaining, 4. Obviously, the previous question has carried. We now immediately proceed to vote on the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland.

The gentleman at station one is recognized.

MR. COPELAND: Leon Copeland from Charleston, West Virginia. What is the previous question? I see here a rule change, but it's not in the form of a proper amendment.

JUDGE MIKVA: Because of the point that was made before, the Chair ruled that it would not hold anyone to making an amendment in its technical form because of the fact that there is a new document here.

MR. COPELAND: Who will do that?

JUDGE MIKVA: The parliamentarians will put it in the proper form so that it conforms. If there is confusion about what is intended here, then a point of order may be out of line.

MR. COPELAND: So it's a blank check then to the parliamentarian?

JUDGE MIKVA: No, I hope not. Is there confusion in the gentleman's mind about what is intended by this motion? Does the gentleman make a point of order?

MR. COPELAND: Point of order, then.

JUDGE MIKVA: Does the gentleman make a point of order against the form of the amendment?

MR. COPELAND: Yes.

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order. With the interpretation that was given by the gentlewoman from Maryland, and with the statement by the chairman of the Rules Committee as to the number of subgroups within each theme group, the Chair is prepared to rule that there will be no discretion by the parliamentarians in effectuating the wording of this motion. It will be clear that the theme groups will be entitled to present the number of resolutions according to the number of groups within their theme, which means that one group will have nine, a second group will have ten, a third group will have four, a fourth group will have seven, and the fifth group will have four—for a total of 34.

Since there is no discretion that will require the parliamentarians to further interpret what is the clear intent of that motion, the Chair will rule that the point of order is not well taken.

MR. COPELAND: Appeal the ruling of the Chair.

JUDGE MIKVA: Appeal the ruling of the Chair has been taken. That is not debatable. Please clear your machines.

A PARTICIPANT: Take a voice vote.

JUDGE MIKVA: It takes a two-third vote. Those in favor of the ruling of the Chair will vote yes, A; those opposed will vote B, no; and those abstaining will vote C. This is on the ruling of the Chair on the point of order. You have one minute in which to vote. I would remind everybody it takes a two-thirds vote to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

My apologies. I am quoting you congressional rules, which requires a two-thirds vote. It takes a majority vote to appeal the ruling of the Chair. Therefore, a majority vote presently voting can overturn the Chair's ruling on this question.

MS. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, point of information. I'm Becky Anderson, delegate-at-large from Rhode Island. I would like to ask a question about the present rules or the rules that we were given today in the packet we received.

JUDGE MIKVA: Will it affect your vote?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes, it does, because I want to know if, in fact, under the system that the staff has set up, there would be five to eight priority resolutions from every theme area, which means we would have a total of up to 40. If I vote for this amendment, am I voting for a reduction in priority?

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chair will state that we are not yet voting on the amendment. We are voting on a ruling of the Chair as to what the amendment is. Therefore, your point of inquiry is not well taken at this point. You may renew it as soon as we finish this vote. We are in the midst of the vote. Let's finish this question of parliamentary procedure and we'll get back to your question.

The question, again, is on the appeal of the ruling of the Chair. Those who want to support the Chair's ruling that the motion is in proper order—that's all I ruled—and that the parliamentarians can word it, will vote A, yes; those who think the ruling of the Chair is bad and that it should not be sustained will vote B, no; and those who desire not to vote at all will vote C, abstain. Has everyone voted who wished? The machine is closed.

(Applause.)

That's the biggest vote I ever won anything on (Laughter.) The question now refers to the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman?

JUDGE MIKVA: Before I recognize anybody, the gentlewoman at station four had an inquiry, a point of information.

MS. ANDERSON: Which I'm still not clear on.

JUDGE MIKVA: I would ask the chairman of the Rules Committee to state her interpretation of the present rules as against the existing rules.

MS. WARDEN: To clarify, under the present rule as it is drafted, you could come up with between 25 and 40 resolutions. The motion from the lady from Maryland would reduce this to 34.

MS. LYNCH: Point of information.

JUDGE MIKVA: Let me also remind everybody that the Chair is indulging points of information, but the business before the house, as ordered by the delegates, is a vote on the amendment and there is no further discussion permitted at this point. I will indulge some points of information because you obviously want to know what you are voting on. The gentlewoman at station three.

MS. LYNCH: I'm Ann Lynch from Nevada. The information that was just given to us said that we would have between 25 and 40 resolutions. However, on page nine it says that the delegates will vote on the top five, that we could collect five to eight, but eventually we would be voting on five. I wanted some clarification on that.

JUDGE MIKVA: As the Chair understands the interworkings of those three pieces of the proposed rules—and the chairman of the Rules Committee or anyone else can correct me—the ultimate number of priority resolutions under the rules as proposed before the amendment would in fact be a maximum of 25. Is that correct?

A PARTICIPANT: No, a maximum of 40.

JUDGE MIKVA: Eight votes by five is 40, a maximum of 40. Someone else can decide this differently later on. I would suggest this would be something you would want to clear up.

As I read the language, while more resolutions might be presented in the plenary session—anywhere from five to eight—the top five priority resolutions for each theme area will be forwarded to the general voting session for vote. And as plainly as I can understand it, it means a maximum of 25 would come to the plenary session. Therefore, I believe that the mathematical effect of the gentlewoman's motion from Maryland would be to increase that maximum potential to 34.

I remind everybody that we have some ordered business before the house, and unless there is a point of inquiry to clear up any further confusion about what you are voting on, the business before the house is voting on the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland.

The gentleman is suspended unless he has a point of inquiry.

MR. DILLON: Mr. Chairman, Howard Dillon of Illinois. I have a point of inquiry that I would like to ask the maker of the motion through the Chair, if I may.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman may state his point.

MR. DILLON: I would like to ask delegate Beaman of Maryland if the purpose of her amendment is permissive? That is, in the proposed rules before us there is a maximum of 25 resolutions permitted, not required. Do I understand that the purpose of her motion is permissive, in the sense that it would permit, but not require, a maximum of up to 34?

MS. BEAMAN: Yes.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentlewoman indicates that is correct, and that is the way the Chair has interpreted what has been before the house. May I remind again everybody that we are under an ordered vote. Unless someone has further points of information or inquiry, I would like to move to the business that has been ordered by the delegates.

All those in favor of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland—which you will recall will be to increase the number of permitted resolutions up to a maximum of 34, as distinguished from the present maximum of 25—will vote A for yes; those opposed to the amendment will vote B for no; those abstaining will vote C. Will you first clear your machines?

(Discussion takes place.)

Those in favor of the gentlewoman's amendment, with whatever confusion there is on it, will vote aye; those opposed will vote no; those who are too confused to vote will vote C, abstain. The machines are open. You have one minute to vote.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

JUDGE MIKVA: Have all of you voted who wish? If so, the machines are closed, and on this question of adopting the amendments to the rules, the ayes are 259, the nays are 168, and 13 abstaining. The amendment is agreed to.

(Applause.)

Are there further amendments to the rules?

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentlewoman at station four.

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm Mary Williams, chairperson of the Virginia delegation. I would like to move our amendment, which is in the package of amendments that you already have. It has to do with the seating of alternates along with the delegates. I have heard comments tonight how this would be logistically impossible. I don't think that is the case for our delegation, and I know this is true for a number of other delegations with whom I have spoken. The alternates have been an integral part of their delegations and I think it's a shame to isolate them in the other end of the room.

I would also like to make two suggestions which don't have to do with rule changes, but I think it would help things logistically: that you try to get two more mikes; and that you try to get a floating mike so that we can recognize the disabled in their seats rather than making them to go the mikes.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: The two points are well taken. The amendment is clearly in order and there will be discussion on it. I would point out, though, that if the present procedure for voting only by delegates and not by alternates is to be continued—and I think that is endemic through the planned Conference thus far—you have to figure out how you make sure that only delegates vote if you're not going to sequester the delegate section. I would hope that in the discussion of this amendment there would be some attention paid to that point.

The gentleman from Texas at station three. You recognize that the question before the house is the amendment of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the question on the amendment.

A PARTICIPANT: Point of order, no second has been made.

JUDGE MIKVA: Point of order is well taken. Has there been a second to the amendment?

A PARTICIPANT: I will second the amendment, and I would like to speak also in support of it.

JUDGE MIKVA: I would ask the gentleman from Texas to withhold his motion. It is in order, but clearly where a controversial motion such as this has just been made and there are people standing anxious to be heard, I think the delegates ought to hear some discussion before it's put to an immediate vote. Would the gentleman withhold his motion?

A PARTICIPANT: I will withhold the motion, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chairman recognizes station four.

A PARTICIPANT: First, I would like to second the motion made by Ms. Williams. Second, I would like to speak to the merits of it.

These people who have been elected as alternates are brilliant people. They have worked hard. They are people with great talents. The purpose of being here is to deliberate, and I believe that these alternates have contributed and can further contribute to the deliberation of the matters about which we are here. I would therefore urge that we arrange to seat them. They're all in the room now, and there's no reason why they can't be seated with the delegations.

Now, in terms of who votes, you have only a limited number of voting machines anyway. Of course, it's a matter of maybe one is absent and the alternate votes. But at any rate, you only have a limited number of machines and those machines can be situated so that each State will have its own particular number.

JUDGE MIKVA: You people have been very, very patient and just great. I think this is one of the more controversial amendments, and I think if everyone will forebear the private discussions for a little bit and hear what the delegates have to say, maybe we can resolve this. The gentleman at station one.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you. My name is Kevin Dickerson. I'm a delegate from the State of California. I have a couple of observations speaking in support of the amendment.

Number one, the logistics. The States are not necessarily seated by States as it is, because there was no provision made for this as they came in.

Number two, I can see the need to have alternates there because of open hearings being held, and alternates serving staff purposes as well. However, I do see the logistical problem. And as far as voting is concerned, may I suggest—and I will not make it in the form of a motion, only just to air this opinion—that something be set up to allow the alternates of a State some accessibility to their delegation, to assist them with the actual delegates' voting responsibilities. Is that understood?

JUDGE MIKVA: Yes. Has the staff noted these suggestions? Obviously at this point we don't know what the final outcome of this decision is. I recognize the gentlewoman at station four.

MS. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the delegate from Alabama, Betty Collins. I speak in opposition to the motion. I feel that in any deliberative assembly you have certain persons who are elected as voting delegates, and we represent our States. We have alternates who were elected alternates. I think logistically and every other way it would amount to a lot of confusion, and I sincerely urge that we support staff in their plans and not disrupt everything at this point. I speak in firm opposition to the motion.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: Delegate at station two.

MS. CALLOWAY: Mr. Chairman, Bertha Calloway from the State of Nebraska. I am not representing the State of Nebraska, but would like to speak from a point of personal privilege. I would first like to say that I think most of the people came to the Conference to discuss libraries and what we can do about it. I don't think we came to nit-pick and argue about small points and rules of order. I would like to go on record as saying that I think if we're interested in libraries and what we can accomplish, that we should start immediately to go about doing that and stop all the nit-picking and the other things that are going on.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: The delegate at station one.

MS. ANDERSON: Barbara Anderson, California. I would like to caution you on the problem of inter-seating the alternates. This may also lead to seemingly a larger delegation from a State. We're from one of the farthest reaches of the country. We come as a large group of delegates, because the delegates have been proportioned according to the population in the States. States that are close to Washington could have a larger number of alternates also attending, since the alternates pay their own way, generally. And I think that this would be very difficult: I'm in opposition.

JUDGE MIKVA: You are in opposition to this. The gentleman at station one.

MR. WELDON: I'm a delegate-at-large, Edward Weldon. I ask what would be the effect, sir, of the passage of this on the delegates-at-large who are omitted?

JUDGE MIKVA: May I seek information of the maker of the motion. Would you care to answer the very legitimate question of the delegate-at-large?

MS. WILLIAMS: What he spotted was a typographical error. It was "State delegations and delegates-at-large." I would be open to a friendly amendment.

JUDGE MIKVA: That amendment will be construed as a technical amendment. If that amendment is adopted, the parliamentarian will make any correction. The gentleman at station four.

MR. ATALIG: My name is Felipe Atalig from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. I rise to speak in support of the proposed amendment by the lady from Virginia. We do have several alternates from our territory who travelled more than 20,000 miles just to attend this Conference. These people paid their own fares. Upon arriving here, they have not been even recognized. They were not even considered as delegates. These alternates are the real persons who originated the idea of the pre-White House

Conference in the Territory of the Pacific. I feel that at least they should be given a little courtesy and should be considered as part of the delegations for this Conference.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentlelady at station three.

MS. IVORY: I'm Ming Ivory from the State of Massachusetts. I'm in favor of the spirit of this resolution, but I think it's far more important to have the alternates able to speak within the small work groups than it is to have them present in the voting, which they can't do anyway.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman at station two.

MR. McCARROLL: I'm Brian McCarroll from Connecticut and I would like to move the question.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: The question has been moved. Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

THE PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman?

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman will suspend. When the previous question is moved by a delegate, and it is seconded, the Chair has only two alternatives: 1) to ask the gentleman to withhold if there are other people seeking recognition; and 2) to put the question. I will ask the gentleman who made that motion if he is willing to withhold at this point, since there are other people seeking recognition.

MR. McCARROLL: No.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman declines. Therefore, the question before the house is: Shall we vote the previous question, which will cut off debate on this amendment?

Let me remind you again that this is only the procedural vote to cut off debate. Those in favor of cutting off debate and voting on the amendment of the delegate from Virginia will vote A, yes. Those who would desire more debate will vote B, no; and those who haven't made up their minds will vote C.

Clear your machines. The voting machines are now open for one minute.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Have all voted who wished? The time is up. The question on the previous question is yes, 386; no, 6. Obviously the delegates desire that the previous question be ordered.

Those in favor of the amendments of the delegate from Virginia, which will be to have the alternates and the delegates seated together, will vote yes, A; those opposed and who want to continue the existing arrangement . . .

A PARTICIPANT: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Do not Robert's Rules of Order cover where, if we were to adopt these rules, matters are unspecified?

JUDGE MIKVA: Robert's Rules of Order do not cover where people sit.

THE PARTICIPANT: Right. So, in other words, if the matter were to come up again, would it not just be simpler to appease both factions and just call for a ten minute recess and thereby they could consult with one another?

(Chorus of nays.)

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chair will construe the gentleman's point as a question, and I think that the question that he is asking is in order whenever you're in plenary sessions or at any time to move for a recess or to call an individual recess. The answer is yes. And when you move for it, if enough people agree with you, you can have it. If it's a personal recess, you can take it any time you want to.

(Laughter.)

The Chair did not mean that with the kind of connotation that you thought. I was referring to the fact that during the plenary session, if the consultations with the alternates were important and this motion were not to pass, obviously one can go and consult with the alternates and the alternates can come and consult with the delegates. That is always in order. A motion for a recess is always in order. But the question before the house at this point has been voted, I believe, by a two-thirds vote. The previous question has been voted by a two-thirds vote. The question, therefore, before the house is the amendment of the gentlewoman from Virginia. It is really in two parts. It is to seat people by States and to have the alternates and the regular delegates sitting together. Is that correct? That is the way it was stated in the amendment that was proposed this afternoon. I call your attention to what it says. Let me read the amendment.

"State delegations and delegates-at-large, State delegates and alternate State delegates seated together by State." So that you understand it, it is the alternates and the delegates not only seated together, but by State. That is the motion that is before the house at this point.

Everybody clear your machines. Those in favor of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Virginia will vote A, yes; those opposed will vote B, no; and those who wish to abstain will vote C. The machines are open for one minute.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Have all voted who wish? The machines are closed. Those in favor are 416, opposed . . . . clearly the machine has gone berserk. It is declared no longer functioning, as if you didn't know.

We will try it by a standing vote. This is a very important amendment. I have tried not to color the discussion or the decision by the delegates, but it is an important amendment. I want to make sure that we get an accurate count. I don't think I can do it by the ayes and nays.

THE PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, we have handicapped people in this room. Let's take account of that fact.

JUDGE MIKVA: The point is well taken, and anyone who is handicapped may vote by whatever means is most convenient, either a hand or a written ballot. I would request the staff and others to record the votes of the handicapped who cannot stand.

The Chair will ask those in favor of the amendment by the gentlewoman from Virginia to rise and remain standing. Rather than keep you up for that long time, we will stand by sections. Will those delegates in that section over there (indicating) who are in favor of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Virginia, rise and remain standing; and would those who need assistance in voting, please so indicate? We will have staff over there to make sure your vote is recorded. Those in favor of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Virginia, please stand and remain standing in that section. I am going to count all delegates who are standing. I would ask people who are not delegates to please clear that section.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

I count four delegates there standing. That section will be seated. Those in this section here broken by that center line, those in favor of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Virginia, please rise and remain standing; and those who need help, please indicate your need. I am counting everybody remaining standing who is a delegate.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

In the third section, those in favor of the amendment rise and remain standing.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

In the fourth section way over there, those in favor of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Virginia who are delegates please rise and remain standing. Those who need help, please so indicate.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

In the section on my far left, I would ask those delegates who are in favor of the amendment to rise and remain standing. If you are not a delegate, please clear the area or sit down, please.

157

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Those opposed to the motion in the section to my far right, please rise and remain standing.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Would those in section two rise and remain standing?

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Would those in section three rise and remain standing?

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

The Chair declares that amendment is not adopted. The gentleman in section two.

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, John Rice from Louisiana. I would like to move the previous question on the original motion.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: The previous question has been moved and seconded on the motion, which is the adoption of the rules as amended. You will recall that only one amendment has been approved. If this motion is adopted, that will terminate any further discussion and any further amendments. The question has been moved. There are other people seeking recognition. Does the gentleman wish to withdraw his motion?

MR. RICE: No.

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentleman declines to withdraw his motion. Therefore, the question before the house is the moving of the previous question. I will try it with a voice vote first. Those in favor of the previous question, which would be cutting off debate, will say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed will say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of the Delegates have voted for the previous question and it is adopted.

The question now recurs on the adoption of the rules as amended. Those in favor of the rules as amended will say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed will say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The rules are adopted.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: The gentlewoman is recognized at station four.

THE PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make an appeal to the body for decorum, because I foresee a lot of cynicism already, and this is just the first general meeting of this convention. So, if it's going to be like this at this meeting, how will it be for the rest?

MS. GOODMAN: Point of information.

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman at station one.

MS. GOODMAN: Laura Goodman, New York. My point of information relates to the resolution we passed a few minutes ago or we rejected, which had two parts. In the discussion I really did not hear two parts being discussed.

I would like to know whether there is any possibility for bringing to the floor separately the idea of sitting by States, which was included in the other resolution that had the alternates as a part of it.

JUDGE MIKVA: The Chair will state that at this point the rules have been adopted and any amendment to the rules will require a two-thirds vote and some place in the agenda. Now, that I will leave to other heads in terms of when it could be brought up.

The Chair will also state, again, since the amendment has been rejected, there is nothing that prevents people from sitting in whatever manner or shape they want if they are delegates. Clearly if they want to sit by States, not only can they, but I would trust that the staff would try to facilitate that any way they could.

The question obviously was mainly between delegates and alternates sitting together. The gentlewoman at station two.

A PARTICIPANT: Would someone on the Rules Committee interpret the rules to me on the point of whether or not the alternates have permission to participate in the discussion in the small working groups?

JUDGE MIKVA: Clearly yes.

THE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, Joe Scanlon, Missouri. The Conference having completed its program, I move we adjourn.

(Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: We are going to adjourn within minutes, I assure you, and you will be recognized for making that motion in a very short period of time.

I will tolerate a few points of information.

MS. SLOCUM: Grace Slocum from Maryland. We have a resolution concerning an enlargement of the committee on follow-up of the conference. I'm wondering what is the appropriate way to bring that kind of a suggestion to the body.

JUDGE MIKVA: That would be at the general session. It is not covered by the rules.

MS. SLOCUM: And would this be by a petition of 100?

JUDGE MIKVA: Yes, that is correct. Or it can come out as a resolution.

MS. SLOCUM: The resolutions have to come out of the theme groups?

JUDGE MIKVA: That is correct.

MS. SLOCUM: Otherwise it would come as a petition of 100?

JUDGE MIKVA: That is correct. Either one would bring it before the plenary session.

MS. SLOCUM: Thank you.

JUDGE MIKVA: Ladies and gentlemen, it is 12:35 at night. I think you have been incredibly patient, and I really think that this bodes very well for the rest of the Conference. I think you are going to have great results.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized on his motion to adjourn. All in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

(Whereupon, at 12:35 a.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

Participants

Moderator:
Frank Fitzmaurice, Producer
National Public Radio

Speakers:
Clara S. Jones
Member
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Francis Keppel
Director
Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies

Herbert D. Benington
Vice President
The MITRE Corporation

New York State Senator Major R. Owens

Bernard Ostry
Deputy Minister of Communications for Canada

Five Conference Themes

Friday, November 16, 1979

Proceedings

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Welcome to our session on the five Conference themes. This panel will be moderated by Frank Fitzmaurice, a producer for National Public Radio, who will introduce our distinguished speakers.

Frank is a specialist in transmitting important information to large audiences throughout the Nation. In his work with National Public Radio here in Washington, he has been responsible for live radio coverage of many important events in the Congress and from the White House. He has also supervised the production of multi-media information programs which combine printed material and audio tapes to present diverse perspectives on national issues.

Frank has also served as moderator for many National Town Meetings on national issues at the Kennedy Center here in Washington. Frank, let us begin.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you very much. National Public Radio consists, of course, of about 225 non-commercial radio stations around the country, about ten of which are owned by municipal library systems.

This is General Session II on the principal themes of this White House Conference. We have five distinguished speakers, each of whom will be addressing one of the principal Conference themes. Each of the speakers will speak to you for about ten or 15 minutes. That takes us up to about 11 o'clock, at which point the hotel people will be setting up microphones in the aisles. That will be your chance to ask questions directly of many of the speakers for half an hour.

I would like to introduce the first speaker, who will be talking about the aspects of personal needs use of libraries and information services.

Clara Jones, director of the Detroit Public Library from 1970 to 1978, now teaches library science at the University of California at Berkeley.

As director of the Detroit library system, Ms. Jones led planning, design, and operation of an innovative program to tailor library information services to the personal needs of the people of that city. This information service program is called TIP, the acronym for The Information Place. Libraries in Detroit provide answers to more than 80,000 inquiries a month about how to get help for problems relating to health, social security, transportation, and many other subjects of daily concern. Library specialists from other cities, both in this country and abroad, have visited Detroit to study the TIP program.

Please welcome Clara Jones.

(Applause.)

Personal Needs

MS. JONES: The five themes of the Conference encompass so much that each one of us will have to be highly selective in what we talk about under each heading—and believe me, that is difficult.

The term "information society" will probably come to our minds very often during this Conference. The incredibly swift advance of science and technology, together with expanding research in the social sciences and other fields, especially since World War II, have brought about an information explosion and a publishing explosion.

The volume and staggering potential of research and invention have heightened the significance of the word "information" for science, industry, business, education, and libraries; in fact, for everything.

Approximately $38 billion is being spent annually in this country on research and development. Half of our work force is engaged in occupations that relate to the production, processing, and distribution of information. The utilization of scientific, technical, and social information is the basis of decisionmaking that will affect the quality and stability of our lives and those of generations to come.

Another term in wide use, coined by Daniel Bell, the eminent Harvard economist, is the "post-industrial society." Its central idea is that, having evolved from a pre-industrial society which was occupied with the extractive industries—agriculture, fishing, forestry, mining—into an industrial society, which was based on manufacturing and commerce, we have now entered into the post-industrial society, wherein our emphasis and work force are concentrated in the sphere of services, technical and personal.

From another perspective, this term post-industrial society suggests that our society will more and more be marked by interaction between people, rather than between people and nature or between people and the fabricated means of processing the resources of nature.

And then comes a deduction that is highly significant to us. I quote: "Our primary institutions are expected to be the university, the academic institute, the research corporation, the industrial laboratory, the library."

Libraries and information science are inextricably involved as primary moving forces in the post-industrial society in which we live. Strong new challenges are already coming. It is basic to existence in our technological society to provide big and sophisticated information services, on a scale hitherto unheard of, through both the public and the private sectors.

On a different level, but an equally important level, access to pertinent, accurate information is the key to effective decisionmaking in personal affairs, just as it is in research, business, government, education, etc.

Everyday information needs of individuals are increasing as contemporary life grows more complex and impersonal. It is important to bear in mind that information is not only big servicing, big business, big government, and the big scientific industrial complex, but also small, individual, and a necessary part of people's everyday lives.

In the final analysis, the purpose of all human activity is to serve personal needs. In an information society, where the work force is heavily concentrated in the sphere of professional and technical services, personal needs will inevitably be more clearly articulated than formerly. It seems logical to anticipate, therefore, that our approaches to undertakings of all kinds will be altered eventually. In what ways, constructive or not, remains to be seen.

In the library and information science world, the public library is, of course, the most direct supplier of information for personal needs. It will be hard to think of ways in which we can meet the challenges of the information era when we are plagued by budgetary problems and cutbacks. We might say, "All we can do is just stay open and try to hold on, waiting for good times." But I would say, "When are the good times, except when we look backward fondly and selectively through rose-colored glasses?"

The challenges that are coming to us now we must meet with courage. We must be willing to take a hard look at what we have been doing all along. We must realize that more money to keep on doing what we have been doing, without meeting challenges, will be self-defeating in the end because it will not enable us to more effectively deliver information to people, which is our true mission. We must face what needs to be done and incorporate it into our planning, into our thinking. It does not mean that we will simply do the usual review and patching up, strengthening here and there. A true overhaul is needed when the challenges are as great as they are today. This means straight across the board in supplying personal needs with information from libraries. It means that children's services must be developed and strengthened in spite of the challenges that are facing us.

(Applause.)

The President spoke to us this morning of his experiences in a library as a child and what it has meant to his life. That experience points up that librarians help children to discover the pleasure of the use of their minds. What could be more important? This goes down the line to all sectors of our society. In the midst of cuts, in the midst of seeming discouragement, we must still plan imaginatively and move forward.

A noteworthy response to individual information needs is the development of community information and referral services in public libraries. There has been sufficient exploration of the concept, undergirded by documented, successful experience, to warrant serious consideration by librarians and citizens at large. Community information and referral service is an expanding dimension of traditional reference work that is coming to the foreground as a vital force in public libraries.

In the past, because the public library did not view itself as the comprehensive information center of a community, nearly all the information it provided came from published materials within its collection. There was no systematic attempt to direct the public to sources outside the library or to coordinate in-house reference questions with relevant community resources.

Acceptance of this larger role means that librarians are beginning to realize their responsibility for the great body of unrecorded community information. They are discovering that their professional skills are transferable to organizing and providing information of any kind from any source. It is as reasonable to supply answers to these life-coping questions as it is to search traditional sources to identify a literary quotation, verify spelling or birth dates, which we do all the time in libraries, or look up a patent number.

Community information and referral service, not as an add-on project, but fully integrated into traditional service, proves to be expanded reference work.

In the pattern of contemporary life, the mass media, particularly television and radio, surround everyone with a plethora of instant information, much of which is not useful because it is piecemeal or unrelated to common needs. Most people are not motivated or able to undertake a laborious search for information they need, especially since it is often couched in unfamiliar language or forbidding format. Many people are not even aware that answers to their questions exist, or that assistance with problems might be available to the community. It will be an important step, therefore, for the public library to take, to become a comprehensive information center in every community.

Libraries are plagued by the image that we are nice, but not indispensable. It is very simple to see that if we had a warehouse filled with all the knowledge there was, but which was not organized and serviced, it would do no one any good. But this image plagues us at budget time, that we are icing on the cake, but not meat and potatoes.

We must face up to this problem. This Conference must face up to this problem. The citizens here who are participating know this as well as librarians do.

Proof of utility is the hard test in hard times, which means all of the time. Libraries are at the heart of civilization, and yet we are wrestling with the need to cut back. Perhaps we are being told, "You must close a half dozen branch libraries." We must stand on our two feet and say, "Would you cut back in that manner in education, for example, saying that the children at such-and-such schools here, there, and yonder will no longer have schools, will no longer be taught to read and write?"

When the cuts come, they must come across the board, to everyone, as far as libraries are concerned. And if the leaders, the well educated, protest, that is all to the good.

We have all kinds of practical problems to face, but we must relate them to the demands of the information age. I am sure that we have grown too cynical to think of libraries in terms of having anything to offer that is compelling and irresistible—perhaps except to our mystery fans, who certainly find it that way in returning again and again.

But I want to suggest that one breakthrough, not a panacea, but a major breakthrough, does have some of these qualities, because wherever it has been introduced the public has accepted it very enthusiastically and has used it extensively. I suggest that in dealing with the overhaul that we must face up to and the challenges that come to us from the information age, it is not out of order to offer information service as a gut level service that reaches people where they are and grabs their need.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FITZMAURICE: Our next Conference theme to be addressed is the use of library information service for lifelong learning.

The speaker is Francis Keppel, a man who has been in the forefront of learning education programs for many years. He is now director of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, where he heads their program for education in a changing world.

Mr. Keppel also serves as a senior legislative representative in the Harvard University Graduate School of Education. In the early 1960's, he served as United States Commissioner of Education and as an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He was one of the chief legislative architects of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Before joining the Aspen Institute, Mr. Keppel served as chairman of the board of the General Learning Corporation, an educational affiliate of the General Electric Company and Time, Inc.

Mr. Keppel.

(Applause.)

Lifelong Learning

MR. KEPPEL: In the discussion guide that you have somewhere among those papers, the one related to lifelong learning was prepared for this conference by Professor R. Kathleen Molz. Eight issues on the topic of lifelong learning were brought to your attention. In view of the time available, it obviously will not be possible for me to review those issues. Therefore, I can only urge you to read this discussion guide and also to look particularly, when you get the chance, at the section of the document called "The Summary of Pre-Conference Activities," which deals with this topic.

I may have miscounted, incidentally, but I think in that section there are 177 separate resolutions on this topic alone for you to consider and to put into some kind of priority order. Since most of them suggest more tax money to do more of what is now being done, the choice of priority depends on what kind of dollar support you think will be available.

I suppose, given that fact, probably the most civilized thing for me to do under the circumstances would be to quit now, leaving you time for a prayer and meditation.

(Laughter.)

Alas, however, periods of silence at American meetings are not customary and tend to be unnerving. There is the horrid feeling that the other person is writing faster or thinking faster than we are. So let me provide what I might describe as some background drumming—slow, ornamental, background drumming—while you decide what you want to do about this topic and how to vote on 177 resolutions.

While you're doing this, let me suggest in this background drone three what seem to me fairly basic policy decisions that will affect the directions that we are going to take in the next 25 years. I hope that these will help to order the priorities on a lot of the related issues.

The first of these decisions may seem to you too obvious to be worth discussion. For generations, Americans, and above all librarians, publishers, and editors, have fought to carry out the provisions of the first amendment of the United States Constitution. You remember it. "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people peaceably to assemble."

Some of the noblest traditions of the libraries and of the press have grown from the defense of these freedoms. Why, you may ask, do I raise the issue today? The reason is not that we face an assault from the forces of censorship, or oppression, or dictatorship of opinion—at least no more of an assault than we have always faced. The reason is of a different character and yet, I suggest, perhaps of equal concern.

Let me quote one of the papers sent to us as background reading, written by Paul Zurkowski, dealing with the emerging information age. Forgive me for a fairly long quote:

"A third aspect of the information age is its trend toward centralization. Obviously, if the system of freedom of expression in this Nation developed during the Gutenberg era—that is, of dispersed and decentralized printing capability—is to survive, we must begin considering how to protect that system when the media involved requires centralization. If the media of the information age is electronic, largely invisible in operation, and depends on a central computer facility accessible through a centrally controlled communications system, it becomes imperative to address the question of who controls the switches of information if a system of freedom of expression is to survive.

"The answer will ultimately be found in first amendment terms," he says. And then he comes to a conclusion that may have shaken some of you as it did me:

"We are moving from a predominantly industrial age to an information age, from decentralized publishing and information dissemination activities to electronic centralized networks, from a free enterprise system to increased Government controls, especially in the industrial environment. It is time we stopped to take stock of what this means for the free marketplace of ideas in our cherished freedom of expression. There is a clearly marked trend towards the growth of a centralized state press in secondary information activities."

I do not ask you to agree with his conclusions, but I do ask you to take seriously the questions he raises. If, as seems likely, there will be a steady expansion in our society of lifelong learning by all our citizens, then the nature and the availability of information services for that learning becomes a very great matter of continuing concern, above all to libraries and other sources of information.

Unintentional censorship can be as dangerous as intentional. The system of government we established to control what Mr. Zurkowski describes as "the switches of information" become a matter of the first importance. There is, I think you will agree, a strong argument to be made for continued decentralization and countermanding powers against becoming centralized.

A second decision involves the extent to which we believe that libraries and information services should take a central role in providing both the learning materials and the human services to help lifelong learning—including the materials and the services made possible by the new information age.

Surely few will disagree that whatever is done should be done in concert with, and not in opposition to, the existing educational institutions. The problem is whether or how much libraries should take the lead, because if they do take even partial responsibility for assembling materials, using electronic developments and using computer capabilities, libraries will have to face policy questions on how to finance and manage such materials and services.

I will be candid and say I was surprised—from what I can gather from reading the resolutions that grew out of State conferences—that most of the emphasis on financing was placed on the balance and extent of local, State, and Federal taxes, and relatively little on direct charges to users.

We all know that organized educational programs are extremely expensive. We know that Federal policy in post-secondary education is to finance that education by loans, grants, and work-study for students, for the individual. Is it reasonable, I ask you, to think that this Federal policy will be radically changed for lifelong learning if it is handled through libraries or other institutions?

If the decision is taken by this Conference to play a larger role in lifelong learning by using the latest developments of information services, I submit to you a further decision is necessary. The present methods of financing, the capital costs of hardware and, indeed, some of the software, are, I think I'll say flatly, not adequate. And it may be unlikely that user charges could solve the whole of the problem. Perhaps this is an area for categorical grants, to use the Federal lingo. In any case, I submit that this issue deserves careful study before policy is determined.

A third decision also lies ahead. It's clear that we are only at the start of linking traditional library methods of governance and finance to the demands of either information science or of the probable growth of lifelong learning.

I submit that this statement is demonstrated by the nature of the great majority of the resolutions as recorded in the summary, which in effect propose improvements in present practices. It may be that these practices will have to be radically altered before the end of the century. Should this be the case, then the materials on pages 74 and 75 of the *Summary* on research and development in technology should be given your most careful attention and high priority.

As an observer of the scene, I have the impression that there is a long way to go before the optimistic promises of information science can be turned into economic realities, and that we must increase substantially our present estimate of the scale and the costs of an adequate research and development program. We must not, I submit, make the mistake of promising our clientele that we can deliver too much too soon. I did that, and many of my generation did that, in the middle 1960's.

Fifteen years ago, you may remember, there was a euphoria about what the electronic age could do for education, a euphoria that soon changed to disillusion. Now I think there is a new euphoria, and let's not lose it. Fifteen years ago, we did not have the R&D basis on which to build. Therefore, we must not neglect the very basis of gaining the knowledge that we need to progress in this new area, progress toward professional competence, toward integration of information resources, and toward economic viability.

If the Conference decides to give top priority to R&D, it must also be prepared to reflect the findings of R&D in the education of the professionals and the managers, both before and on the job, who will carry out these changes in the future.

Perhaps a new profession is in the making, or at least a substantial change in the content of preparation. The size of the task of R&D and the task of revising programs of professional education for the new era, in any case, require that these two interrelated tasks be given a third top priority for our consideration.

Freedom of the press, the role of libraries and information services in providing the methods and the means for lifelong learning, and the demands of R&D that may lead to a new profession—these three issues, I submit, deserve our special attention. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FITZMAURICE: The third of the five Conference themes is the use of the library and information services for organizations and the professions, and our speaker on this topic is Herbert D. Benington.

Mr. Benington is vice president of The MITRE Corporation, a research and development company. Prior to 1963, he worked on computer design and programming for the United States Air Defense System. He then joined the United States Department of Defense, where he was Deputy Director for Plans and Assessment in the Office of the Director of Defense Research in Engineering.

The MITRE Corporation for the past 20 years has included a number of developmental projects. One of their major priorities has been the analysis, planning, and development of systems in improving library and information services, appropriately enough. Mr. Benington is general manager of MITRE's Metrek Division, which focuses research on systems development for air transportation and for problems involving energy, resources, and the environment, all of which sound like a full-time job.

Mr. Benington.

(Applause.)

Organizations and the Professions

MR. BENINGTON: Thank you very much, Mr. Fitzmaurice. It's a real honor to be with you today. As you heard from my introduction, I am a fellow librarian. I am in the information services business, and my comments will bring you some news from that area, then I will close on a comment to the librarians.

In doing my homework, I noted that my theme area has the fewest number of issues—except for the international—and the lowest interest on the part of the delegates.

I find that strange, because my main message to you is that the business of information services, in particular for organizations and for professions, has been undergoing a true revolution since the mid-1970's. I think in the 1980's we are going to see a continuation of that revolution, and I want to talk to you about it.

I think that in this particular area—and let me separate it for awhile from technology and education—the United States is making a progress that is unprecedented, which is having a fantastic impact on our productivity. This is going to continue. I will give you some examples.

Let me talk about six factors quickly. First, there is technology. About 25 years ago, I worked at MIT, and we built a computer that would occupy about one-third of this room. At the time it was one of the first very high-speed computers built for high reliability that could work in an operational system. It took us six years from the time we knew what we wanted to do until the time that computer was working. It cost us $2 million in parts and labor, and those were 1950, not 1979, dollars. It was a very, very large venture.

Today, as a result of technological development since then, that computer costs $10 and can go through the eye of a needle. And I think the most important thing is that today the technology for that computer, from design to test to completion, could be done in two weeks.

Just imagine the tools that it has taken to put together—the design tools, the planning tools, the production tools, the testing tools—so that a mathematician, a logic designer, could sit down with a machine in his mind that is much more complicated than that one; and we could go through an automated process ending up with a reliable system in two weeks. That technology is just about in hand.

We have progress of 100 percent about every year. We have triple-digit inflation in the progress that we're making. We know that is going to continue for the next ten years. The laws of physics are there, which means that we're going to find another factor of 1,000 increase in productivity in this area during the next decade.

Let me relate this to libraries. Today we can store the 17 million books and periodicals that are in the Library of Congress in mass stores that are commercially available and would just about fit on this stage. We have the communications satellite technology available today—it hasn't been flown yet, but it's available—whereby we could take the entire 17 million volumes in the Library of Congress and transmit them via satellite from New York to London in less than eight hours. These are the kinds of information storage and communication capabilities that we're talking about.

A second factor in this information revolution is the extent to which private corporations already have found that they need this technology to do their business.

I was talking to the chairman of the board of the Hughes Aircraft Corporation, which is a multi-billion dollar corporation. He described his job as managing the information services at Hughes and said that so much automation has come, so much information service has come into all parts of their business—planning, marketing, production, engineering, sales—that his job is knowing how those information services are developing, what the plans are, where they should be tied together, where they should be left separate so they can move ahead more quickly.

A third factor is the tremendous amount of information that becomes available and stays alive as needed. This ranges all the way from surveys that we do in rural areas to satellites that collect information on the status of the earth's surface or on what's going on in the outer stars. This information can be stored in digital form and moved around very easily. It's probably going to be cheaper in two years to store the printed page in this digital form, on tape, on the video disc, within a computer, than it will be to store it on paper. I have heard very good estimates that within ten years it is going to be cheaper to store very high quality color photographs within this digital form than it will be to store them as we do today.

So this information can be captured; it can be moved around; it can be stored; it can be analyzed.

The fourth factor is the growth of a very large infrastructure which is providing information services to organizations. I'm not talking about the people who sell computers or computer programs. I'm talking about the people who are putting together very large private networks of computers and communication and will sell a very large variety of services on the free market. This business is starting to explode now. I'm sure you know some of the large manufacturers that are getting into it because they see a tremendous market. So, in the same way you can buy communications today, you will be able to go buy your data processing and your data processing services by the yard from these organizations.

The fifth factor is the ambition that people have to be able to network all of these services. Then if we have a large company with its own organic information services for all phases of its operation, and if it's dealing with two large suppliers of information services, we're aiming to get a compatibility among all of them.

In the same way you can go out in that hall and pick up the phone and direct dial a hotel in Paris, within ten years if you have a computer and you have a data base, in principle you will be able to browse all of the data bases in the country that are made available to you to browse. You will be able to communicate with their data processing capabilities and select what you want from them.

And, finally, a note which says we're not getting too centralized. I think the reason that this great progress has been made is that it has taken place within the free market. We have seen companies start at the special services, move very quickly into them, and fail; but we have also seen some grow. We have seen very large companies adapt, but there is still great competition between the large corporations.

I think for the most part that the American public really is not aware of the extent to which this kind of capability is here now, or of the rate at which it's spreading into other organizations, professional and otherwise.

One of the best aspects I've seen of the way people feel about this growth was when I was visiting IBM at one of their advance production installations recently. I was talking to people in their mid-50's who had grown up with this business and who are now the senior managers of that activity. I was extremely impressed with the euphoria that they felt, not because they saw some promise, but because they knew they were starting to do things that really were changing the business. Now, these are people who have been in the business for 30 years. You would think they would have become jaded. Instead, they were all enthusiasm, smiles, and youthful vigor because of the things they were starting to do there, which are going to impact this market during the next ten years.

One of my concerns is that there are two segments that are going to have trouble taking advantage of this kind of system progress. It's not technology; it's systems. One of them is very large: the Federal Government; and one of them is small: the small user, the local user.

In the Federal Government—both because of Acts of Congress and because of the ways that very large bureaucracies tend to work in central ways—I see many regulations, many laws, many policies that I think may tend to inhibit the ability of the Federal Government to take advantage of these services that we're talking about.

I think equally important to you, to the extent that the Federal Government is not with it—does not have people who know what is happening in the business—it is going to be hard for them to get the support and the right kind of ideas to provide the money and the key places where they can help many of the things that you're concerned with.

I have talked about a major new industry which is already under way: corporations exchanging information services, providing information services. This has happened on a scale which I would call one of mid-centralization. It has not become a nationalized enterprise, and I see no threat whatsoever in the next ten or 20 years that it will be.

On the other hand, there are such economies of scale that it's hard, as I said earlier, for the smaller user to take advantage of this. Here I think is a great challenge for those of you here who are in the library profession, to find out what is going on, to relate to these activities, and to find out ways in which, as these activities develop, you can take advantage of them and make them available in a local way.

Let me give you a good example of what I think may be one of the greatest challenges here. The technology is available today for computer-assisted instruction. There is no doubt about it. It's not something that we need research and development for. The costs of computation and display and processing have gone down so much, and are still going down, that if you wanted to have a very economic, viable computer-assisted instruction system available, you could easily do it. As a matter of fact, it's been done in two or three cases in a significant way. There is one hitch, and that is that developing the course-ware for a particular subject is quite expensive. It involves much, much more than writing the corresponding pages of a book. On the other hand, once you've developed it, then it can be easily replicated and made available. You can let the local user know it's available. You can develop ways in which he will want to use it in his special way.

So here we have somewhat of a dilemma. I think that the library as an institution should be extremely interested in how computer-assisted instruction could become a part of the local information service. However, if I look at the various institutions that we have for funding—for developing the necessary course-ware, for making it available, for making it responsive to local needs—I just don't see that those institutions are available yet, and I don't know how we put them together.

As you can tell, I am someone more involved in the information services than who knows the library business. In our company, we have a very heavy information services need. We have all sorts of computers and word processors and the like. We also have a library that is staffed by professionals. One of the things that has impressed me very much over the last five years is that our library has in no way withered. Our librarian and the professionals working with her have found out what's going on in the company, what's going on in the library sciences, and what's going on in the community, and they have provided a vital bridge between our high technology, internally, and some of the things that are taking place in the outside.

I hope at this Conference that you find ways of strengthening those bridges. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Mr. Benington. The fourth major Conference theme area is library and information services for governing our society. Our speaker is New York State Senator Major R. Owens.

Senator Owens has written a number of articles on the problems of libraries and of finding effective ways of ensuring social justice for members of minority groups. He is a graduate of Moorehouse College and of Atlanta University. Before he was elected to the New York State Senate in 1975, he directed a community development organization in New York City.

Senator Owens is a member of New York's Black and Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus and of the New York State Council of Black Elected Officials. He has received several awards for his work to improve conditions for minority groups.

Please welcome New York State Senator Major Owens.

(Applause.)

Governing Society

SENATOR OWENS: My participation in about a half-dozen pre-White House Conferences has led me to the conclusion that the concerns the library community feels most intensely about may be placed at two opposite poles, and the introduction here this morning also follows the same pattern.

On the one hand, there is an enthusiastic focus on the infinite possibilities for service improvements through technological gains, including electronic communications, computerized data bases, coin-operated information banks, and other similar devices.

At the other extreme, there is a preoccupation with devastating budget cuts, the emasculation of school libraries, the astronomical rise in prices for books and other materials, and other similar survival problems in libraries.

The present plight of libraries and information services is a dramatic illustration of the need to find ways to more effectively govern our society. We face a dizzying array of gadgets, a star-spangled future with unlimited possibilities, while at the same time the cancer of neglect is killing the frail structures which already exist. Misplaced priorities are the deadly results of a society that is badly governed. In this topsy-turvy world, the challenge is for us to lead the Nation in reestablishing certain vital priorities.

First, our case for vital need must rest on the assumption that this complex democratic society cannot be effectively governed without a knowledge and information system which matches modern society's complexity. The library which is merely a quiet place to read belongs to an era that is ended, an age that is over.

America has some of the best publicly supported libraries in the world, but our existing efforts are still rather primitive when compared to the kind of knowledge and information needs of our time.

Imaginations do not have to be strained or even stretched. You heard the last speaker. We do not have to enter the realm of science fiction to find examples of the kind of information systems which are capable of meeting the public needs.

The previous speaker gave us very good examples. Adequate information systems are already here, alive and well, operating in the service of industry, other private special-interest groups, and selected government agencies. The question is not: "Shall we design new systems?" The question is: "How do we use what technology and human ingenuity as already devised to promote the common good and the general welfare?"

No problem or obstacle related to the development of adequate public knowledge and information systems is insurmountable. But to persevere and overcome, first we must believe, we must be convinced, that libraries are vital. We must feel in ourselves that the flow of information and knowledge to the public is a life and death matter.

When the electorate is ignorant and citizenship illiterate, democracy will surely die. Listen again to the words of Thomas Jefferson, still as wise as they were more than 200 years ago. Jefferson argued that the people are capable of governing themselves if they have adequate education and if they have adequate information. Those who hear and truly understand Thomas Jefferson will not hesitate to set the right priorities, to provide the resources necessary for library systems.

If education and information are the cornerstones of democracy, then there can be no priorities above them. Democratic decisionmaking is on trial. These are times when the ability of the people, of the electorate, to make wise choices is being tested.

You have heard of basic literacy, functional literacy, and information literacy. Try now to go one step further and accept and understand the concept of citizenship literacy. I define citizenship literacy as the ability to use history, current theories, facts, and public pronouncements to guide individual decisionmaking on public issues, propositions, the election of public officials, and other similar matters.

Democracy is on trial because too large a percentage of our populace are citizenship illiterates. Citizenship illiterates sometimes choose to boycott the processes of public decisionmaking. The nearly 50 percent of the eligible voters who did not bother to cast a ballot in the last Presidential election belong to this misguided tribe.

Commenting on this lack of participation in the democratic process on October 24th, Walter Cronkite on CBS radio concluded that since one-half of our citizens are functional illiterates who are incapable of making reasonable decisions, we should not encourage non-voters to become voters. Cronkite's horrifying message was the introduction to a book on the dismantling of the most successful experiment in government that the world has ever seen. As political descendants of Thomas Jefferson, we cannot endorse this deadly proposal for political triage.

Instead of attempting to throw one-half of our populace overboard, leaving them in a sea of ignorance, we must resolve to mobilize all available resources, including television commentators, in a coordinated campaign against citizenship illiteracy.

And those who refuse to participate are the citizenship illiterates who are anxious to acquiesce, to follow blindly, behind experts and dictators.

The experts gave us fiery death in the DC-10. The experts calculated an easy victory in Vietnam and, many thousand dead bodies later, refused to concede their errors. The experts constructed and regulated the plant at Three Mile Island where one nuclear accident threatened the lives of millions.

The events of the last ten years have made it crystal clear that we must have the knowledge and information to protect ourselves from the experts.

Better than all other indicators, there is one prevailing phenomenon which clearly illustrates the need for better information systems. Examine the opinion polls, and you will find that the collective mind of the electorate is a great ball of confusion.

We repeatedly contradict ourselves. We express great anger and dissatisfaction at the elected officials whom we ourselves have chosen. We demand specific solutions to problems which run directly counter to our expressed general beliefs. Confusion is the result of continual bombardment by the propaganda of vested interest groups. It is a by-product of the mild trauma that voters experience each time a politician promises one action before election and then reverses his position after election.

Confusion comes when we are forced to depend too heavily on biased, self-serving information sources. Some sacred places where objectivity is the goal, where diversity of viewpoints is the rule, where thoroughness is possible—some public shrines which make the swift search for truth feasible—are needed. Before democracy is consumed, sucked down into a spectacular phantasmagoria of contradictions, of confusion, let us build a strong national public knowledge and information system.

It would be folly to argue that libraries alone stand at the brink preventing our democracy from plunging into chaos. Certainly they are not the only element needed, and despite our strong emotional commitment we should not blunder into an assertion that libraries are the most important component of an overall public knowledge and information system. We deem it sufficient to say that libraries are a vital part and, where appropriate library services are not included, no public information system is a complete and adequate structure.

The key message of Plato's *Republic* is that justice exists when every element in society is accorded its proper place. Many interests contribute to the vital flow of knowledge and information. Appreciating and encouraging each unique role is of paramount importance for the preservation of a total, modern, free communications environment.

Libraries should never attempt to do what the free press can do better. Public school systems, on the other hand, should not flee from their duty to develop programs which decrease the amount of basic and functional illiteracy in our society. Television commentators should not usurp the role of political organizations. Colleges and universities should assume greater responsibility for the provision of education for citizenship literacy. Privately owned radio stations should not pretend to be as objective and disinterested as the variety of viewpoints found on the shelf of a public library.

If all of the components were arranged on a continuum from the most costly to the least costly, commercial television would be at one extreme and libraries would rest at the opposite end. Although it has the largest audience, because of its enormous cost, television will never convey anything more than miniscule amounts of the information needed to maintain citizenship literacy.

Radio, popular magazines, newspapers, and lecture halls follow suit. As the costs decrease, the thoroughness of the available information increases. On any given issue or subject of public significance, television and radio are likely to do no more than trigger the interest and the curiosity of the public.

Magazines and newspapers may expand and amplify beyond the electronic media, but only the public library will provide the citizen with a variety of viewpoints and a cross-section of coverage. In other words, the library is potentially the final satisfying organ for any search stimulated by the other components of the overall knowledge and information construct.

At the place where the search ends for people who want information to help them make decisions, citizens deserve the best that is available. Terminals for computerized data bases, video cassettes, oral history tapes, teletype lectures, newsletters from the radical right, and newsletters from the radical left—nothing should be off limits for the public library.

In order for libraries and information services to contribute to the effective governing of our society, a new national public knowledge and information system must be created. Within present-day budget constraints, this is possible. It can be made workable.

We do not need a bureaucracy preoccupied with central control and detailed direction. That is not necessary. However, a national body with certain specified Federal powers must be placed at the apex of a national system. To guide this national policy body, we must adopt the concept of information as a public utility. Information is a record of phenomena observed and a record of decisions made.

The Federal Government is the greatest single sponsor of research and surveys where phenomena are observed, and it is also the greatest single generator of decisions of public significance. The people already own a body of information: census data, the *Federal Register*, topographical and geographical surveys, the text of Supreme Court decisions, the unclassified research of the CIA, Bureau of Labor statistics, etc. This information flows continuously and is forever expanding.

Since the people own the raw material, then it is reasonable to require that certain entrepreneurs who wish to refine and package such raw data be either charged at the outset or taxed on the basis of actual use. Such a requirement would allow the creation of a special fund to subsidize library users of commercial machine retrieval services.

This is only one example of where the concept of information as a public utility may lead us. Funding, we know, is the great and enduring problem; and that great and enduring problem will cease to be a problem when our budget decisionmakers are convinced that our society can no longer be effectively governed without adequate libraries and information services.

The amount of money needed to revamp overnight all the library systems of America, to bring them to a level where they could provide adequate model information services, is miniscule when compared to the amounts our populace spends for tobacco and liquor. Since no one is proposing an overnight revamping, the amount of money is still small. However, the amount is not so small as the pitiful pennies presently offered by our Federal Government.

In all of the years since the first Federal support for libraries began through the Library Services and Construction Act, the total Federal funding amounts to less than the cost of two aircraft carriers. To change this scandalous situation, Presidents, governors, mayors, congressmen, legislators, city councilmen, all must be made to understand that libraries are more important than improved sewers. Worse than contamination from poor sewage, ignorance is a poison forever seeping through the systems of our body politics.

Too many elected officials hold office because they have manipulated the gullibility, flattered the worse instincts, and generally preyed upon the ignorance of the people. Across the country, most of these elected officials are consciously or unconsciously hostile toward the development of library information services. In any given era or period, it is quite possible for public officials to collectively and systematically commit errors that are monumental and atrocious. The treatment of libraries over many decades represents such a secret scandal. The inadequate funding of libraries is a major blunder, a ghastly example of inverted priorities.

It is my hope that this historic Conference will resolve that we should not bear tamely the continued neglect of our libraries. This eager and enthusiastic body gathered from all parts of America must reaffirm the passion of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson showed no concern for sewage systems, because he knew that great civilizations have been built without costly and elaborate concrete pipes, but democracy can survive only if the people have adequate education, only if the people have adequate information.

When all the deliberations of this Conference have ended, let us return home with at least one unifying thought. We believe in Thomas Jefferson. Libraries are not sentimental ornaments. Library information services are vital for effectively governing our society. Library information services are vital for the survival of democracy.

(Applause.)

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Senator Owens. The New York State Senate must be a very interesting place to be.

Our final speaker is going to be speaking to us on the subject of the international understanding aspects of library and information services. He is Bernard Ostry, Deputy Minister of the Department of Communications for Canada.

Mr. Ostry has also worked as an author, broadcaster, and a scholar. He graduated from the University of Manitoba in 1948. His postgraduate work included stints in international history at the University of London.

Mr. Ostry joined the CBC, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, in the early 1960's and was the moderator of a CBC radio program, "Nightline." He later served as supervisor of the network's Department of Public Affairs for radio and television and received several awards for production.

Mr. Ostry was Commissioner of the Prime Minister's Task Force on Government Information from 1969 to 1970. He has also written several books including *The Age of McKenzie King: The Rise of a Leader*, and a number of articles on Canadian social, political, and cultural history.

Mr. Bernard Ostry.

(Applause.)

International Cooperation and Understanding

MR. OSTRY: Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, I think that after the last speaker we would do well to stop. I would be glad to make way for questions.

(Laughter.)

I need hardly say that it's an honor to be in this historic place, in such distinguished and powerful company.

I should like to thank the convenors for inviting me to introduce from a Canadian viewpoint your fifth theme on libraries for increasing international cooperation. I add my special thanks to Mr. Charles Benton for encouraging me to come and to Mr. Joseph Becker for giving me the benefit of his great wisdom on the subject.

I thank you for myself and for my country. Our two countries have a common dedication to liberty and the dissemination of knowledge for all our citizens and if, as trading partners, neighbors, and allies, we cannot achieve cooperation and understanding, then it's unlikely that we shall be able to achieve them in our relations with the rest of the world.

In the words of Mr. Becker, "It is here that the first crucial steps will be taken." Perhaps it's not a bad idea to have a Canadian here anyway. Because of the immense size of our country and the way our comparatively small population is scattered across it, we have had to become expert in the technologies of communication.

In the past, the canoe, the telegraph, and the railway took us across the continent; and in the present century, telecommunication has been vital to national development.

Marconi made his first transmissions on our soil. You may be shocked to learn that many of us lay claim to Alexander Graham Bell, whose body lies in Nova Scotia. And more recently we have done pioneering work with communications satellites, optical fiber, the application of micro-electronics, digital transmission, and video-text technology.

But there is more to the life of a country than technology. Our history and our politics have not favored the creation of those integrating symbols that unify American society. From the beginning, our far-flung communities have preserved their distinctiveness as offshoots of the European and even American society. They have sought to guard their autonomy.

You all know about Quebec. But are you equally aware that, to date, only Nova Scotia has ever tried to secede? Time hasn't brought us much closer together, but we've learned to agree to differ. We have become intensely aware of the importance of understanding social and cultural differences in nurturing civilized life in any context. We have learned the value of understanding among our own people and among the peoples of the earth. Our nation is founded on give and take. World cooperation cannot be rooted in any better ground.

There is another reason why I think you might find it worthwhile to hear a Canadian voice. Of all the peoples in the world, yours and ours are most alike—those of us speak French no less than those who speak English. Cooperation and understanding between us is rooted in the complex ties that bind us together.

Could anyone seriously suggest that libraries and information systems, concerned as they are with the intangible life of the mind, might affect the stability of our relationship? That's precisely what I am going to suggest, that we are so alike that we are blinded to our subtle but genuine differences.

If a Canadian can tell you that new technologies in this apparently mutual field pose a serious threat to this country's independence and continued existence, what would someone from a less closely related country say?

Let me begin by suggesting the conditions I believe necessary to cooperation and understanding in this field; and then, by way of example, describe how you might apply these principles in developing library and information services in Canada. Finally, I shall argue that these lessons can be applied to all kinds of information exchanges, through all countries.

Cooperation is a tricky word. It seems to me that true cooperation must begin with respect for differences. But even where that exists, even where the differences are too obvious to be missed, cooperation doesn't always lead to understanding. Take the story of the lobster and the oyster. A Cape Breton fisherman looked over the end of the wharf one day and saw a lobster cooperating with an oyster. The lobster turned red, white, and blue with emotion and at last crawled off away into the shadows. The fisherman addressed the oyster. "You should be ashamed of yourself," he said, "carrying on like that with another species. It's bad for the ecology and I don't know what else. And besides, it's pointless. Nothing can come of it."

"But don't you see," said the oyster, hugging herself in ecstacy, "that's just the point. It was pure, disinterested. No ulterior motive whatsoever. None. My pearls."

(Laughter.)

But even between consenting shellfish, cooperation may not be beneficial to both partners. Of course, my country and yours cannot be compared to such low-life creatures. We are sovereign nations. Our government, like yours, has the duty to safeguard the rights of a sovereign people to freedom, to security, to independence, to bread, and to opportunity.

And since it is a duty, it cannot be shared, traded away, or sold down the river. We look forward to a time when all our citizens will have equal access to the knowledge, to literature, and the art of the whole world, will be made free by the whole mind and imagination of mankind. That's what our libraries are for. That's what our museums are for; what our schools and colleges and universities are for; our communications networks, our broadcasting, film, and publishing industries.

But I am sure you will agree that, in all this, it would be irresponsible not to leave room for the growth of mind and culture of one's own people. Canadians are not to become, they will not consent to become, mere passive consumers of knowledge and culture packaged outside their borders by purveyors who have no interest in their concerns, and little or no knowledge of their political, economic, and cultural identity. Even for those whose tastes do not run to tea parties, this could become vexation without representation.

Canadians have always had to live with this problem. It's now a problem all countries of the world will have to live with. The merging of communications and computers makes it possible to transfer, process, and store data in centers outside countries' borders; and therefore subject to laws not of its own making.

This fact alone gives every sovereign nation a new interest in information and access to it. Sovereignty is now perceived as going beyond the geographical realm. Nations cannot give up the responsibility to make their own decisions about their own countries, or to conserve and foster their economies and cultures.

What we are talking about is nothing less than the survival of independent nations. Cooperation then is a two-way process. William Blake remarked, "One law for the lion and the ox is oppression." Maybe my fish story has a similar meaning. One law for the crustacean and the biota may well be larceny. The necessary conditions for understanding and cooperation are mutual respect for sovereignty, not only in the territorial sphere but in the economic and cultural spheres as well.

Now, how do these general considerations apply to our concern with libraries and information services? Some of us who are closely in touch with the dazzling achievements of the new technology are apt to sound like "star trekking" when we talk about libraries, as if the human mind had already been replaced by silicon intelligence and the computers had ousted librarians. But the library remains—perhaps will always remain—a center of human intelligence. It may be augmented. It will not, in my view, be replaced, by computers.

It is the nature of things human that they exist in family, local, national, and international context. So the first thing to remember about the National Library of Canada, for example, is that it is a Canadian institution, collaborated, first of all, with other Canadian libraries in the service of a Canadian people, and only then with other North American and sister institutions abroad.

The National Library of Canada is a comparatively new institution, little more than 25 years old, and its underdevelopment does us little credit. But a retrenchment, and limited budgets for this and other Canadian libraries, have brought their own benefit, in that they have opened the eyes of librarians to the advantages of sharing and cooperating.

In the future, it's likely that the National Library might consider, in cooperation with other computerized bibliographic centers, a decentralized bibliographic network to insure the fullest sharing of information and library materials among Canadians wherever they live. Any such plans would have to be coordinated with Canadian communications policies and would probably make use of international and foreign indexing and abstracting. This is one way in which international cooperation could reduce costs for all user nations.

There has even been talk in Canada of a task force that might be appointed to study the interface between library-based information services and new Canadian videotape systems, like Teleco, or other techniques by which home users could interact with them. All parts of such a plan will call for an unprecedented degree of cooperation among bibliographic centers at all levels.

Since you yourselves are blessed with a federal system, you will hardly be surprised to learn that we too have problems of jurisdiction and bureaucratic conflict. Our national librarian probably already perceives difficulties in resolving the problem of ownership.

Meanwhile, pumping our information services into American computers is already threatening our independence in the economics sphere. My own department of the Government of Canada produced disquieting evidence of the nature of the threat.

In 1977, a survey of some 400 firms and organizations in Canada indicated that the value of transfer to computing services could escalate to $1.5 million by 1985. At least 23,000 jobs could be lost to Canadians by the same date, and possibly as many as 100,000. The evidence also showed that 90 percent of the computing transfers to the United States was by Canadian subsidiaries and branches of foreign organizations. We already have unemployment and balance of payment problems which are causing concern to our politicians.

It might seem that the national security has nothing to do with library and information services; but if a country allows all its vital data on business, on culture, and on the economy to be stored outside its borders, it becomes alarmingly dependent on the integrity and reliability of the foreign enterprises that provide its computer services. Its security is thus compromised.

These are blunt words, but they are spoken between friends. Only when we have assured control over our own foundation of information networks can we truly be agents of cooperation and subjects for understanding. Only when our two countries meet free and fair on those terms will we be ready to set an example of cooperation to other countries.

In a paper given on the subject in Florida last week, Adrien Norman spoke even more bluntly. Adrien is an Englishman, but he is also a senior member of one of the leading United States consulting firms in this field, so he sees these questions from two sides.

He argued that the American political system would be incapable of adapting its own institutions to the aspirations of other nations. His conclusion, profoundly pessimistic, was that the country which most eagerly seeks to ensure the free flow of information internationally will prevent the making of the international agreements necessary to achieve this goal, and the absence of international agreements to remove barriers will lead to national and regional measures to protect indigenous industry and culture.

No Canadian can be quite so pessimistic. Having lived next door to the United States for so long, we Canadians hold it almost as an article of faith that differences between our countries can be worked out to our mutual benefit. We have too much to lose to believe otherwise. Confrontation has never been our way, and our long history of cooperation has left us with most of the mechanisms needed to resolve these problems, both in industry and government.

And when we sit down together to tackle issues, I hope we shall agree to put the question of library networking high on our list of priorities. Something no less valuable than dollars or jobs is at stake: the integrity of the mind and imagination of two free peoples. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FITZMAURICE: We have come to the portion of the program where you, the members of the audience, get to question the speakers directly.

Let's start with the gentleman up front in the center aisle. Yes, sir.

MR. CHACHRA: My name is Vinod Chachra. I'm a delegate from Virginia. My question is addressed to Mr. Herbert Benington.

The great success of computers and communications is partly based on the complete and transferred interchangability in the application and use of the two media. A part of the problem of applying computer technology to libraries is the burden of wording the existing knowledge base into machine-readable form.

Where we see great advances in going from computer media to print and voice and so forth, I see remarkably little advances in going in the reverse direction from printed words and so forth to the computer media. Why do you think we are not making progress in that direction? Because that is absolutely necessary if we are to use computer technology for libraries.

MR. BENINGTON: I generally agree with your observation that people in the past 25 years have had great hopes that we could go from the printed word, the spoken word, into the computer, and that the progress has been relatively slow. And I myself, at this stage, cannot promise any great progress.

I think in going from the written word, more and more as we're getting into typesetting, word processing, and better optical character recognition, that we will be able to make some progress. Going from the spoken word into computers is moving ahead very slowly, though. It takes a very large computer system to understand the vocabulary of several hundred words in a limited context. I think this is one of the barriers that we have to work on, and one we have to recognize.

MR. FITZMAURICE: All right. Our next questioner is a gentleman in the aisle to my left.

PARTICIPANT: I'm a delegate-at-large from the State of Illinois. With the increasingly technical information storage, retrieval, and transmission systems, I'm wondering if we may face a problem keeping the management of our information system in the proper hands; by which I mean, in the hands of those who we either elect or select to manage, as opposed to the effective control falling, by default, into the hands of the technicians.

I would offer as an example of what I'm talking about the event of a year or so ago, when a computer expert managed to transfer a considerable sum of money to his personal account through his knowledge of a computer bank transfer system. It seems clear to me that the misuse of information systems could be immeasurably more destructive and dangerous than the misuse of our banking system. And this other event occurred right after my local banker had explained to me the failsafe system that they had in effect to prevent this kind of misuse by people with technical expertise.

So I'm just wondering whether any of the speakers see a danger in this area and, if so, how do we try to handle it?

MR. FITZMAURICE: Mr. Benington?

MR. BENINGTON: These are two important issues. On the subject of management, I agree with you very much that that threat is there. The reason that I tell the story about the chairman of the board of Hughes, saying that he was the information manager, was to reflect that when you have as pervasive a computerized communications systems as a large corporation like that has, that he's fundamentally responsible to see that making changes in that system is the responsibility of the management of the organization—assisted by technicians, but not dominated by them.

The second question you raise is one of security. Senator Owens warned us about trusting technical people, as we have been for awhile. When you get into those problems, I think that, in fact, today progress is being made in security. It's something that you can easily handle, if you're quite careful about it; but even then there will be some few people who will continue to pull "DC-10's" on banks.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Mr. Benington. Let's take a question from the gentleman in the aisle to my left.

MR. KLINE: I'm Marty Kline from WBAI Pacific Radio. I would like to ask Senator Owens how the widespread availability of home computer terminals will affect the future viability of libraries that provide computer services?

SENATOR OWENS: I don't think we are going to see a widespread availability of home computer programming. It's an item which may find its way into a small percentage of middle-class homes; but for the vast majority of the population, the likelihood that they're going to have home computers is very slight, despite the fact that the costs have gone down greatly.

I think it's more probable and more feasible for all libraries across the country to have computer programming or terminals in libraries of various kinds. But that is a goal which is attainable and more real.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Senator Owens. The gentleman at the near mike in the center aisle.

MR. SCANLON: John Scanlon from the State of Missouri. I would like to address a question to Mr. Benington.

There is considerable concern among delegates about the possible establishment of a national library network. I believe you pointed out there is a definite lag in the technological field between those in Government and those in small industry, and I presume that applies to libraries as well. Do you see any conflict in time between a push for a national library network and this explosive development in the private industrial field?

MR. BENINGTON: Well, first of all, sir, I would carefully remember that you are from the State of Missouri, and on this subject, generally speaking, I am too.

One of the things that I didn't have time to stress is, I believe that one of the great aspects that has helped the revolution that I was talking about is a recognition that the systems have to be distributed, confederated, delegated, interrelated—but not optimized in some ideal centralized fashion. I think once we started acting that way with respect to the computers, the communications, the organizations, the people, and the management, and learn how to manage, that we created a climate at what I call the mid-centralized level, which has really allowed us to move forward very quickly.

With respect to a national network, I don't know enough about it. I know that our library absolutely needs all the data bases and the networks that it ties into, but I don't know enough about the issue of a national network.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, sir. The gentleman at the far mike in the center aisle.

MR. SMYSER: I'm Dick Smyser, a delegate from Tennessee. As the rest of you were, I was very taken with Senator Owens' talk but I must comment on one point he made. He suggested that Thomas Jefferson was insensitive to sewers. Now, as anyone who has been to Monticello knows, Thomas Jefferson personally designed a most intricate and beautiful sewer system.

As a lay delegate, I simply want to suggest that maybe, for technical reasons, we offer people some other alternative between libraries and sewers. I would have difficulty making the choice. If you care to respond, sir?

(Laughter.)

SENATOR OWENS: Vast amounts of money have been poured into the sewage systems in our country recently, partially as a response to environmental considerations, which are important. But sewers also contain some of the worst corruption going on in this country right now, and the vast amounts of money being poured into the kind of systems that they are being poured into now is questionable. For that reason, I did single out sewers. There are a number of things that are going on there which we ought to take a look at. They made a priority out of proportion, I think, to the need.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Senator. Let's take a question from the woman in the aisle to my right.

MS. BRUMBACK: I'm Elsie Brumback, delegate from North Carolina. I would like to direct my question to Mr. Keppel.

In a time of austere budgets, when citizens cry for more accountability in spending and new programs, there also seems to be a push by the general public for schools to take on more responsibility at both ends of the spectrum. For example, the community school Acts that are across the country right now, and a push for—some call it race in a new generation—it's going back the other end of the spectrum with the pre-school program.

In the past, these responsibilities, the lifelong learning and the early childhood learning, have been public library responsibilities. As former Commissioner of Education, do you see this as a school library responsibility, a public library responsibility, joint venture? What are your thoughts on that?

MR. KEPPEL: I suppose the answer that you would expect, and which I'll give, is: All of them do it all. That is a very American response, and also very characteristic, I think, of our society—that at the same time libraries and schools are being asked to provide more services at lower costs. This is going on for both the library world and the educational world.

I don't see any solution to the question of lifelong learning, except a much more effective collaboration between local schools and local libraries. It's the only way I can see it work.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Mr. Keppel. We'll take two more questions. Let's start with the gentleman at the near mike in the center aisle.

MR. BRADLEY: I am Tom Bradley, delegate from Maryland, and my question is related to the last one. This is directed towards Ms. Jones and her presentation on personal services.

If I understood the presentation correctly—and I'm paraphrasing—there was a statement made that most people get their information from libraries. I would like to offer that there are hundreds of thousands of boys and girls in school libraries who daily get much of their information in their education. And in the further part of that presentation, there was an innuendo that competition for funds needs to be taking place, where public libraries may have to go after the funds that may have been allocated to schools.

In a period where school funds are rapidly shrinking, there is a national trend to closing schools. I suggest that many communities go through the heartbreak of having to close community schools.

All in all, what I'm saying is that I don't think that there needs to be competition, but rather between school libraries and public libraries there needs to be a partnership. If we remember those young students who were using libraries or media centers, or whatever you call them, these people do grow up and they are going to be taxpayers. I wonder if you might react to that? That was to Ms. Jones.

MS. JONES: My principal reaction is that I agree with your statements and your attitude, and there was no intention on my part to suggest rivalry and competition. I am a great believer in cooperation rather than competition.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Ms. Jones. We have time for just one more question. The man who has been waiting the longest is the man at the far mike in the center aisle.

MR. SIMON: My name is Ralph C. Simon from Toledo, Ohio. My question is directed towards Senator Owens.

We all appreciated his speech very much, but one thing that did disturb me was the repeated use of the word "adequate," which is sometimes related to the word "normal" or "average." Could we perhaps not find another word which would, shall we say, have a more positive connotation for all of us?

SENATOR OWENS: I can't think of a better word or I would have used one. I think one of the tasks of this Conference is to deal with deciding what is adequate, and the bigger problem is deciding how to get the funding to approach what is adequate.

There are all kinds of standards, of course, developed by the American Library Association and other groups. Those standards have something to do with what we were talking about when we were talking about adequacy. But in some areas, they have not even started developing standards, have not considered it at all.

So I can't refer you to them to get a definition of it. That's one of the tasks, I think, that we have to wrestle with here at this Conference.

MR. FITZMAURICE: Thank you, Senator.

Thanks to our participants today. Thank you for coming. Good morning.

(The session adjourned at 11:30 a.m.)

November 16, 1979: Luncheon Session

Remarks of Robert B. Pfannkuch

MR. PFANNKUCH: Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to be here. It was a pleasure to work on one of the committees that worked on putting this operation together. I think it's very exciting and very challenging, and a real look forward to what can be done. I feel very strongly that a lot of work that will come out of this Conference will sustain us for many years in the future of information handling in the public sector.

In this videotape, we have just seen an example of what the future holds in the way of some freedom for the television set that hasn't existed in the past. Indeed, the television set, as an information dissemination device, has been largely restricted by both its time schedule and its content to the hands of a few people, by and large the broadcasters. I think what we're saying is that this is going to change, and it's changing right now.

By the end of this year, a million homes will have videotape recorders in them. Although they are not, in and of themselves, new program devices, they do indeed encourage new programming. They largely record off the air. Right now, those programmers and those broadcasters are stuck with building around a narrow slot of time called prime time, which is about three hours a day. Add the magic of videotape recording, and we now have 24-hour prime time. We have the ability to broadcast in that other unused or lesser-used 21 hours, and have it reused during our own personal prime time.

To try and sum up the impact of the 12 minutes of technology you've just been shown in about 10 minutes is a rather formidable task, so I'll have to restrict the probably hundreds of issues that could be addressed to two or three.

Because of videotape recording, the individual use of television in the home will become much more prevalent. People will be able to watch what they want, when they want to watch it. I think we'll also find this a much more encouraging area for the program producers. Freeing the programmers from having to go through broadcast networks may provide some very exciting new programming opportunities.

But television's new role as a supplier of programs for the special use of television, as opposed to the general use of television, is an area that I think poses both a threat and an opportunity. Libraries represent one of the existing distribution technologies, if you will. What we saw here today talked a great deal about electronic distribution, as opposed to physical distribution; and, by and large, I think the libraries represent the physical distribution side of the equation. But I feel very strongly that, although all this wonderful delivery system, satellite, disc, and tape, are there, we are still going to be faced with the issue of physically getting the programs. Because even if programs are being transmitted by satellite into homes, someone requires, and demands, and sets the schedules as to what goes on that satellite to the home, or what goes on that cable to the home.

I think the marriage that we see of the new electronic distribution technology is very exciting. Taking existing physical distribution, and marrying it to electronic distribution, poses a very good alternative, and a very good opportunity. It also poses some threats, one of which I would like to just mention. Next week, a company called Fotomat, which has 4,000 little yellow kiosks sitting around the parking lots of this world, after a year's pilot test, will be offering nationally rental libraries of some 100 feature motion pictures. They have leapt into an area and said, "There's room for a commercial world of librarying. Go in and rent—get your video cassette right now, bring it home and use it, then return it." Right now, it's restricted primarily to entertainment programming, but as someone who is reasonably close to the organization, I think it's very clear that if a market develops for how-to, educational, data base materials, we are going to see the private sector entering in the librarying field of audio-visual materials.

There are lots of materials that will still be restricted by the profit motive, that will be, in many ways, mass media. Maybe thousands or millions of homes will want to see a particular movie; but how about the vast amount of reference works, audio-visual materials that exist? Is there a way to get these distributed? Herein lies a massive opportunity that should at least be explored at this Conference.

There are some 15,000 16-millimeter titles of motion pictures in the educational-informational field available right now. They are available through libraries and through school systems. However, they are very costly to deal with. One scenario I can depict is reaching the physical distribution of the libraries through an electronic distribution system, perhaps by centralizing these 15,000 titles and putting them up on a satellite. If some fairly low-cost satellite receiver technologies were installed at the libraries and school systems around the United States, physically distributing them may be far more cost-effective than trying to use fiber-optics, cable, or any of the other technologies. I think we will see, as we move forward in this area, some challenging opportunities that the group in this room can very well address.

We have a situation that needs governmental involvement. Indeed, there are many public access problems in this area, and some very big issues that affect us. All of these are issues that are being faced today by the vast resources of the electronics and the broadcast industries. Certainly, in the educational-industrial area, we have been very lucky in seeing the growth of television in its more important social responsibility areas.

I encourage everyone here to look at the opportunities. Most of that technology which was described in this tape is being put forth by profit-making organizations, but it has a great many applications in the field in which we all work. Making data available, all forms of data—television data, entertainment data, data-base information, alpha-numerics—by using what these people are putting together with satellites, tapes, and discs offers us an opportunity to do something that I think is very important and very exciting.

I would like to close by saying there has been a gap in what happens in the school, what happens in the library, and what happens in the home. It's easy to take printed material from the school library to the home; but we are living in an audio-visual age, and it has not been easy to take audio-visual material home.

I think we can play a role here. There are some 200 university film associations producing exciting programming every day. There are many video artists emerging. There's a group in Chicago called the Chicago Editing Center, which we support, producing several hundred hours of exciting programming with no outlet. By taking the educational-informational materials that are available today on audio-visual materials and getting them into the home, by moving the videotape recorder and the video playback medium into the home, we have the opportunity to bridge the gap between the formal educational systems and information repositories, such as ours, and bring it directly to the home in this new format.

As we go forward in this future, I urge that we take advantage of and find ways to use this technology to do that.

Remarks of Nicholas Johnson

MR. JOHNSON: Some years ago, a black disc jockey friend of mine came by my office at the Federal Communications Commission and told me about his experience in the first job he ever got in the broadcasting business. He walked into the radio station, and the station manager handed him a stack of records, and said, "Here, boy, you play these."

My friend said, "Mister, what about the news?" He said, "Boy, we don't have any news on this station." And my friend said, "Well, what about the news wire? Maybe I could just read the folks some news off the news wire." He says, "We don't have a news wire at this station." And my friend said, "Well, maybe I could just read the local paper—go out and talk to folks, and find out something about what's going on, come in, and tell the people on the radio station, in between the records."

The station manager turned to him, and said, "Boy, I don't seem to have made myself clear to you. You're not going to educate the people of this community at my expense."

Now, what you can admire about a man like that is the total absence of any hypocrisy. He's right out front, telling you where he's coming from. He understands that knowledge is power, and that the ignorance of the masses is another kind of power for another class in that society, one to which he happens to belong and in which he would like to stay.

You don't get such straight talk from the vice presidents of the networks. Oh, no. They say, "Well, we just give the people what the people want. Why, if we put public affairs shows on, nobody would watch them. And you don't want to put that controversial stuff on. It just gets people upset." Because the television business, as you know and I know, has nothing to do with programming—and I don't care whether it's coming to you by satellite, or off a videotape.

The front cover of *Broadcasting* magazine this week says: We Bring You Starsky and Harriet. Now, you don't know, but there's a show called Starsky and Hutch, which I have to know about, because I'm a TV program repairman who has to follow this. So "Starsky and Harriet's" a playoff of that, see. Then it goes on to say, on the cover of *Broadcasting*, "We can deliver you more women between 18 and 49 than any other show." That's the business they're in. That's the business they're proud of. That's the business they advertise on the cover of their trade magazine. They're buying and selling you like cattle in the stockyard. And just like the cattle, you don't get any of the money, either. You get sold off at a cost per thousand. That's what that business is.

Now, what's happening to it technologically, which NBC didn't tell you about, and neither did Bell and Howell, in some respects, is the extent to which we're using this technology for other purposes than the totalitarian system called television—and I use that word advisedly. You're talking about an instrument that doesn't have a microphone jack on it.

I gave the speeches 15 years ago, when I was on the FCC, and I said, "We're going to have this grand communications revolution, and everybody will be able to work out of their homes, and so forth." And I did believe it, I really did; but nobody else did at the time, and so I sort of forgot about it. And I came back in 1979, and found it was all here. Texas Instruments has got a little portable terminal that you can carry around with you like a portable typewriter; and anyplace you've got an electric plug and a telephone, you're on line. And what you're on line to is the most fantabulous thing you ever could have imagined in your wildest dreams. It's down there in the Conference Information Center. If you do nothing else while you're here, it will make your whole trip worthwhile if you go down there and find out about something called EIES, the Electronic Information Exchange System.

I'm not going to tell you more about it, because I can't. I've only got 10 minutes. For somebody that's used to lecturing for at least an hour-and-a-half at a time—and I've got at least five lectures on this—you can appreciate the pressure this puts me under. But you go down there and look at TI's terminal and the EIES system. You find one data base in that information center. Look at SOURCE, for instance; that's the poor man's version at $2.75 an hour. Spend 20 minutes with it, and really try to understand, if you haven't done it already.

It seems to me a theme has evolved, from last evening through this morning—and I hope it will stay with us through this White House Conference—that the libraries of this country are a revolutionary institution. And those of you in this business, it seems to me, have got to recognize that that is your role. You are in the class struggle. You are in the business of breaking down power. You are in the business of taking away power from the rich and the powerful and the elite, and giving it to the masses. And the rich and the powerful and the elite have never wanted you to do that. They don't want you to do it today. They're doing their damnedest to keep you from doing it. And they're going to continue to do that.

We heard last night from Mayor Marion Barry that knowledge and information are power. We heard it from Rep. John Brademas that the friends of freedom are the friends of open libraries. What do you think they're talking about? They're talking about that radio station general manager I told you about. They're talking about the advertiser that keeps things off of television.

Today, knowledge is more and more in electronic data base form. How are the poor going to get access to it? That's your job. There are a lot of people who don't want the poor to have access to it. They're doing their best to see that they don't get it; and they will benefit, politically and economically and socially, from keeping them from getting it. That's the fight you're in, and there are a lot of people who want to help you wage it.

It's the same problem that we had in the Middle Ages, when the churches owned all the manuscripts. That's the problem you have now. If you've got revolutionaries in a country, what do they go for in order to take over the country? They don't go for the farmland, or the banks, or the factories. They go for those radio and television stations—for the information. That's how you control, how you govern. And that's what's going on in this country right now.

Senator Major Owens gave a stem-winder of a speech this morning, and he brought up Thomas Jefferson, who surely has been walking with us from the beginning of this session, and will throughout, and rightfully so. You know, when he died, the thing Jefferson wanted to be remembered for was not that he was President, but what he had done for education and for libraries in this country. That was, to him, his most important accomplishment and contribution.

That is really the issue that is before us today, at bottom. After you look at the new technology and the books and the budgets and the staffing and all the problems that you've got, the question is, "Are we still committed, as a people, to the concept that self-governing by the citizens of a democracy necessarily requires that the poorest among us will have access to the information of the wealthiest and the most powerful?" That was the issue 200 years ago, the issue 100 years ago, and it's the issue today.

Senator Owens said, "We hope that the Tree of Liberty does not have to be nourished with the blood of each generation." But I'll tell you, as you know, that the Tree of Liberty *does* have to be nourished with the blood of each generation. We've got to go out and fight again for our lives, for this principle, if we believe in it. I think you do. And together, I think we can do something about advancing it in this time and this place.

November 17, 1979: Luncheon Session

Remarks of Bill Clinton

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I think it's very nice that you were kind enough to ask a Governor and the leader of a city government to come here. It's a little painful for me that you picked Arkansas and Dallas, Texas, a poor state and a rich town, but perhaps Mr. Schrader will be merciful with us.

There is one real reason that I'm very proud to be here, apart from the fact that we have been able to advance the cause of libraries in our State. That is that I take a great deal of satisfaction always in being in crowds of people who are interested in books and reading.

Every time I've ever run for office, somebody running against me has said, "That kid's never done anything but go to school, teach school, and read books—he's obviously not competent to hold public office." Every time that has happened, the majority of people—except the first time, and I'm grateful, because then I'd never have gotten to be governor if I hadn't been beaten the first time—have said they didn't mind if someone said somebody should hold public office who had gone to school and taught school and read books. I believe, therefore, that the work which brings you here has a great deal of public support, even in this time of anti-government feeling and anti-tax feeling. It is for you to decide what direction we should take, and what you expect from governmental leaders in manifesting that support.

We're very fortunate in Arkansas to have a fine new State library building. We are now spending about 50 cents per capita on library aid in our State, which I know is not the highest in the country; but only about half the States are higher, and since we're 49th in per capita income, I think that's pretty good. Our new constitution, thanks to Bessie Moore and to some of the people at these two tables here, which the people will vote on in November of 1980, actually contains a provision requiring the State to develop libraries at the local level.

I have had more good fortune in my life than most people. I've been lucky enough to study in some of the greatest libraries in the world, like the Library of Congress, the Bodleian Library at Oxford University. But I can honestly say that I get almost as much thrill out of going into small libraries, as I have all the way from California to the State of Maine.

In my state of Arkansas, the public will support public expenditures for purposes when they believe they need the services, and they think the money is not being wasted. You might be interested to know that in Arkansas, in the last election, people voted against a measure to cut their taxes, 55 to 45 percent. Thereafter, the people in Little Rock, our capital city, which has the highest property taxes in our State, voted twice by popular vote, within the next year, to raise their property taxes, once for their schools and once for the Children's Hospital of Arkansas, which serves all the people of our State.

So I believe that we do not need to foresee a bleak future, as long as people are convinced that what we're doing, and what we wish to do at the State and local level, is in their interests and will spend their money well.

I would like to talk briefly about my view, as Governor of my State and as a citizen, of the function of public libraries today, and in the future, at least in a rural State, for the kind of people we serve. As Governor, I have two distinct but related views of libraries. In the administrative environment, they represent branches of governing bodies—the State, the cities, the school systems, with inherent problems of budget and personnel, which we must try to alleviate. Secondly, they provide services to citizens, students, and scholars, and we must ask continually, in this age of information explosion, if we are meeting their needs. Are we doing it effectively and efficiently? Are we reaching the total population, including the handicapped and the minorities who have remained insulated from our efforts for far too long? For those of us who have citizen boards, are those boards actively and aggressively establishing the kinds of high standards and goals that people deserve and expect?

In a rural State like Arkansas, especially one which has a high percentage of low-income people in the cities and in rural areas, and one with a very high percentage of people in their later years, there are special problems. Therefore, we have to set special priorities.

One of our problems, as you might imagine, is the cost per capita of providing library services to people who are spread out in far distant areas. And one of the things that interests me about the proposed National Library Act, which I understand Senator Javits has already discussed with you, is the formula for distributing the aid which the Act would provide. I think that it should recognize the minimum standards we should attempt to provide in every State, and the real per capita costs of providing those minimum standards, as they vary among the various States of our country.

At the State level and below, we need more cooperation and coordination with all areas of responsibilities. Oftentimes, in individual library units our collections are small. The population which uses them, even around that unit, is highly diverse and dispersed, and our budgets are usually inadequate. Accordingly, it is essential to do the best we can within the current fiscal limits, and not waste a penny. That includes, it seems to me, the sharing of resources through statewide networks, and the provision of flexible interlibrary loan policies, and unified acquisition policies, to prevent duplication of expensive materials.

In northeast Arkansas, at the Mississippi County Community College, we have established what I suppose you would call a multi-layered community library. The community college is cooperating successfully there with its county, and is providing library services to both its citizens and its students. I view this effort as an excellent measure of cooperation, and one which we must extend to other areas of our State, if we ever hope to maximize our resources.

The delivery of rural library services, as I've said, is expensive; but we are constantly reminded that it is an important, even a necessary, investment. Our farmers and local businessmen, our retirees and our children, require more sophisticated information than they did years ago—more, indeed, than they did last month—in order to study continually changing markets and new techniques in their fields and their interests.

Moreover, in Arkansas, and in many other States, we are trying to attract new jobs to rural areas which previously had not shared in the economic growth that have come to us in general. In order to broaden our economic base in rural areas and to provide better employment opportunities, we have to be aware of the fact that it is virtually impossible to attract some kinds of jobs to areas which otherwise could accommodate them. Beyond the economic interests, we must continue to satisfy the personal needs of individuals for information and for learning purposes. As in any area of services, States have to be concerned with the best way to reach people. That becomes an issue of surpassing importance, if you live in a highly rural area.

The bookmobile in Arkansas has been one of our best tools. But, as you might imagine, the rising cost of fuel is having a tremendous impact on our ability to use it and to increase bookmobile services. I am beginning to look at what other innovations we should bring to our outreach programs, in view of the large concentration of senior citizens in rural areas, in view of the very large percentage of handicapped persons we have in our State, and in view of the fact that still, notwithstanding all of our efforts at integration, many of our minorities are still in residential and community enclaves that do not get the full reach of public services that they deserve.

Obviously, every State is acutely aware of the responsibilities and ramifications of improving the services and strengthening the collections available to students in public schools and institutions of higher education. I mention them here only to point out that, in my study of our budgets and our projection of future budgets, the book costs, the paper costs, the printing costs, inflation is going to be at least as high as the rate of inflation in the country as a whole, perhaps higher than the general rate of inflation. If that is true, we have no choice but to band together and work together to maximize the coordination and the sharing of all library resources in the public sector, if we hope to do anything like keep up with the costs and the demands for learning.

There is a critical concern which underlies these issues, and relates to your general theme, "Bringing Information to People." You must remember all the people. As I have mentioned already, libraries, I believe, have to make additional efforts to serve minorities, the handicapped, the aged, and others with special needs and special problems. We do not now know all of the needs of those we have not served as well as we should. Accordingly, we cannot meet those needs without bringing more groups of diverse backgrounds into the decision making process—everything from the planning of buildings, to the decisions about allocations, to the provision of the outreach services that I have already mentioned. I believe you have made a significant beginning in this Conference, and I want to congratulate you for that effort.

The growing need for information, and for a nationally coordinated organization and accessibility system to new information, affects each of us every day. Without even pretending to know as much as I should about it, I can tell you that it is satisfying to me to know that this Conference is working on improving and refining the wide-ranging information services already enjoyed by our people. To keep the commitment of the people, and all levels of government, to pay for the changes and improvements we need in our libraries is imperative. I pledge to you that we will do what we can in our State, within our limits.

I believe that this Conference has a story to tell, which has perhaps not been told as well as it might have been, to the Governors of the various States. I've been talking with your representatives here at the head table, and I want you to know that I believe you should be present when our Governors' Conference meets here again in Washington in February, to tell that story. I will do what I can to see that you have a chance to present your views.

I am interested in this Conference not only as a Governor, but as a citizen. I don't want to get into the kind of anecdotal reminiscence that is so easy for people to lapse into when they look out and see librarians, and think about the ones they knew, and the books they read, and where they spent their hours as children. Besides, the lady who runs the library in the Governor's office has already told me President Carter did a better job of that than I could. But I would just like to remind you of something that perhaps you already know. Every day I try to deal with incredibly difficult problems, and try to make people believe that they can solve their problems, and mobilize them and move them, and save people from wasting their lives, and improve the institutions of our society. But without the ability to read and to think and to believe in the capacity of one's mind, it is impossible for a person, as an individual, to have the sort of security, self-confidence, and sense of freedom on which the whole dynamism and success of this society rests.

Accordingly, it is impossible for a society, faced with the challenges and the stern tests which we face today, to band together, in an optimistic and aggressive frame of mind, to deal with the problems we face. We are being challenged today, I think, in a way that we have never faced before. This is not the worst time we have ever faced, to be sure; not even the worst time in my lifetime. And certainly not the worst time of the last century. But we have unique and profoundly difficult challenges that cannot be met except by people full of hope, with well-disciplined, well-developed minds that give them the sense of security that they can move down the road to a better day.

Not long before he died, our late 81-year-old senior Senator from Arkansas, John McClellan, had a talk with me. We were friends, even though we had disagreed on more than half the things we talked about. He told me a story about his 10-year-old grandson coming to see him when he was 81, saying that he wanted to grow up and have a career in public life, and he wondered what he should do to prepare to be a lawyer or a teacher or a politician. And John McClellan told his grandson that two generations had passed since he was the same age. The world was very different, and he could be sure of only one thing—that he should develop his mind as best he could.

One of my favorite stories is about a lawyer and former law teacher. It involves Oliver Wendell Holmes, who served on the Supreme Court, as some of you know, until he reached the age of 93, and was lucid until the end. When he was 91, his 22-year-old law student broke in on him in his study and found him reading a dog-eared copy of Plato's Republic. And he said, "Mr. Justice Holmes, what are you doing, at your age, straining your eyes with that old yellow-leaf book?" He said, "Young man, I'm trying to improve my mind."

These are the kinds of stories that, if you believe in the capacity of the human mind to liberate and enrich the spirit and to advance the cause of mankind, you never forget once you hear. They mean more, sometimes, than we are aware of. If you just take President Carter, who has been here with you. Think of the pressures that he has been under in the last few days. Think of the opportunities he has had to make a misstep here, doing too much and overreaching, or doing too little, and backing off too much. Think of the incredible discipline it has taken to learn, to think, and to move with what I think has been exemplary decisiveness in an extremely difficult area. I honestly believe that there is a relationship between the manner in which he has conducted himself in this crisis and the time he has spent in his library.

So I ask you, in closing, to remember that, as we talk about the computer technology and microfilm, and all these complicated things that the world has brought us in the new age: do not shirk from mastering them and using them and incorporating them in what we do. Don't ever forget that information is nothing, nothing, if it's not in the hands of someone who can read and think and act. Beyond that, knowledge has a virtue of itself to enrich the human spirit and advance the quality of life that is worth nurturing and worth paying for.

As I think about the future of our State, I remember often these stories that I've related to you. Usually what I ask school children to do is to do whatever they can to make their minds work as well as they can, because that is something that cannot be taken away from anyone. It is the source of our true freedom.

Remarks of George Schrader

MR. SCHRADER: Governor Clinton, distinguished colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, thanks so much for the compliment of the invitation to be here with you today, and the privilege of sharing with you in these important deliberations. I look forward to the results of these deliberations, so that I might share them with my colleagues in Dallas and with my professional colleagues in the International City Management Association.

I've been specifically asked by Chairman Charles Benton to share with you some experiences from my past and some views of mine about the future and its prospects, and to do that from the municipal service perspective.

A city that I know has rebuilt totally its public library system in the last two decades. This city continues to build its library system with pride and with the kind of building style that results in prizewinning architectural facilities out of which to operate. This city has raised, within the last year, $10 million in private funds to help finance the cost of construction of a new $40 million central library downtown, to serve as the hub of library service in the future of this city.

In 1959, just two decades ago, this American city had just five small neighborhood branch libraries, and invested $1.44 per capita, for a $970,000 budget. By 1966, this city had 12 neighborhood branch libraries, and invested $3.10 per capita, for a $2.4 million budget. In 1972, it had 14 libraries, and invested $4.64 per capita, for a $4 million budget. This same city today has 17 branch libraries, and invests $7.89 per capita in library service, for a $7 million budget; and it has $43 million worth of library construction underway, and $2 million more funded for future development and additional neighborhood branch libraries.

This kind of local support and generous giving of local funds only emerges where library services meet the citizens' needs, and the community responds by making use of these services and by offering loyal and generous support for the public library. That kind of association is no fluke, I submit, because this year, just 11 days ago, the citizens of this same community, in a similar kind of association, gave or promised $16.75 million in public funds, and matched between $30 and $35 million in public money for a fine arts museum and concert hall site, and a new theatre.

I know there is such a city in this country, because the citizens of that community and I claim it as our city, the City of Dallas. The citizens of that city and I claim that library as our library, the Dallas Public Library; the city government and the city organization and I claim the library as an essential and major partner in our municipal service program, one which joins us in serving our public, and contributes to the work and the effort of the rest of us in our city organization. Because of the stature and the reputation of effectiveness of this part of our city organization, it has the responsibility for the implementation of the goals for Dallas in community education, continuing education. But no government, and no public library, can achieve results unless it is useful to the citizens and has its suppport.

There are three elements of the relationship of the Dallas Public Library with the community and its citizens which I would like to make a special comment on. The first element is that all new programming and capital development is performed in association with the citizenship. For library planning purposes, Lillian Bradshaw, the Director of Libraries, and her staff are constantly in touch with the users of the library.

Let me cite some examples. Our Friends of the Dallas Public Library, with a membership of 950, are avid users and supporters of the library programs. We seek their advice and their help in planning our services and in planning our future. This Friends group was organized in 1950, with the objective of aiding the library by creating an awareness in the citizens of the specific needs of the library and its functions. It's a committed group of people who give immeasurably of their efforts. They give beyond any measure of monetary value. Their assignment and their opportunity is giving and helping and advising, but never demanding or restricting.

The best example I can give of the Friends' help was in our recent drive for $10 million in private funds to assist in building a library. Led by a former Mayor of the City of Dallas, they led the effort to raise those private funds, and also to acquaint the public on the proposal for the development program. They prepared the public for the bond election, and through their work the banks, the Dallas Advertising League, and other organizations worked on behalf of that drive. The Friends distributed published information. They spoke at community group meetings. They staffed information centers, not only in public, high-traffic areas, but private as well.

The drive for public funds was successful; $10 million was given by literally thousands, by school children, and those distributing the proceeds from estates, and they came from as far away as the Middle East. This $10 million was added to $5 million in grant aid funds and $25 million in funds voted by the citizens of Dallas. After the election, Lillian Bradshaw shared my pride in one of the newspaper headlines: "Dallas Voters Approve Basics: Police, Fire, and Libraries." The Friends quietly moved onto other projects.

The second important element in this relationship with the citizenship is the library's development of its long-range planning targets and objectives. Its program is prepared for my office, and for approval of the city council, based on citizen contributions secured in a variety of ways. Neighborhood committees were held throughout the city, chaired by members of the Library Advisory Board. Citizens were encouraged to come to those meetings to speak, to assist in the planning, and to criticize and indicate the services that they wanted—that they considered valuable.

We seek to tailor library service programs to the areas they serve. Communities are different, and library services need to be different as well. Today we tend to suffer from the delivery of services in a monolithic kind of style, from a cookie-cutter kind of approach. We need to innovate, we need to experiment, and we need to risk—risk success, and just as importantly, not be afraid to fail.

We use questionnaires that are distributed for assessment of public opinion, and we do satisfaction surveys of all those who use the services of the library. The grocery stores and drugstores cooperate with us, so that we can distribute our surveys through them, as a means of securing the opinions of some who may not be using the libraries.

The library invites prominent citizens with special skills to consult with the staff, so that the best of economic, social, and business forecasts can be used in our library planning. We find that these invitations are too attractive to bankers and industrialists and government officials to be turned down, and their free advice and forecasting is invaluable. Of course, it tends to involve each of these authorities in the library responsibilities of his or her community.

The third element that I'd like to mention is the availability, in the library, not only for the people to participate in the deciding but also in the work of the library. That's an opportunity that is open to anyone who is willing to take the training, and 150 of those people have. They enrich the service program of the library by handling reading programs and story-telling and book reviews and checking books and answering the telephone, and doing the work of the library in virtually every way. They permit the library to be something more than it otherwise could possibly be.

In essence, then, we believe that local involvement by those who pay the bills is absolutely necessary for service satisfaction, and for the intelligent and continuing support of city government programs and bond elections, and for the support of libraries.

Today, we are poised here with you at the gateway to the decade of the 1980's and the rest of the Twentieth Century. We're fresh from this kind of an experience. For 18 months now, 35 colleagues and I, from across North America, have struggled for a vision of the future of the 21st Century. We've come to see that we'll have the kind of future that we make for ourselves. Our future will be a reflection of our will, and the reflection of our proficiency in management.

We came to see a fundamental, if not revolutionary, kind of change, requiring management. It would be a great pleasure for me to describe what we saw; but I suggest that you might want to look forward to Alvin Toffler's book that's coming out, *The Third Wave*, because it's going to be essential that we explore that future, if we're going to conquer it. We came to see long-term economic and social prosperity as a possibility, after a decade of management for severe economic and social adjustments. We came to see new worlds of service, and we reported our views and our conclusions to the International City Management Association last month at our annual meeting in Phoenix.

We've talked a great deal about the availability of funding, and we've found in our own experience in the City of Dallas that it's an inescapable necessity, of course—a fundamental necessity. It's a great temptation for all of us, here and at home, to view our ambitions and our achievements of the past, and the limitations on them, as having been limited by the shortage of funding. It's just as tempting to view the prospects for our future as dependent upon the adequacy of funding alone.

If I could make a special point with you here, it's that funding and achievement rest themselves on proficiency of management and mobilization and marketing, as well as on a strategic search for money. We need to build rewarding associations and alliances. We need to build programs and services into the lives of the people, so they are at once a part of them and have a stake in them. And we need to do that through long-term, consistent, persistent work, in building a favorable reputation, in building stature in the community.

The community that tried to get a vision of the future came to see the new world as including the essential city. It came to see the new world's service as including essential public services, which, in my city, if you will recall the headline in the Dallas paper, include not only police and fire protection, but library service as well. I submit that your city should, and can, and has to include library service as a part of the essential city of the future. A new world of service will be more local. It will be aimed at communities and neighborhoods. It will be more locally funded, because circumstances will lead Federal authorities to shift funding to local jurisdictions, and citizens won't want to buy back the local discretion for tailored local programs. And it will involve local citizens investing their time and their service and their work in behalf of it.

Let me discuss with you five strategies of urban service that we see in the future, as a part of the major forces of change during the next 20 years. These strategies may affect your quest for expanded and improved libraries.

We're going to have to learn to get by more modestly in the future. The era of massive growth of public service, more money and more people, is over, happily so. Budgets are going to have to be fashioned without assuming that there will be incremental increases and growth in expenditures, that there will be an expanding pie. No longer will everyone get a larger piece. It's going to be an era, in the next 10 years, of the policy of the shrinking pie.

And there will be a need to leverage our efforts through securing the resources and the cooperation of the private sector with the public sector. It will mean more joint ventures, using private capital for public ends. It will mean the privatization of non-essential services. It will mean a greater effort to improve the local climate for private sector economic activity, so that the private sector can make that greater contribution that it will be called upon to make.

It will be an era of greater emphasis on, and need for, volunteerism. As the availability of discretionary time increases in society in general, a special effort will be needed to encourage people to use a portion of that time for public ends.

And then government and government services will be localized. They will be shifted to communities and neighborhoods. We think this may be the wave of the future. Government that concentrates on the community or neighborhood level will be the kind of government that builds support with the citizens of the future. It may also be the best way for the citizens to help themselves, without the need for government.

For those of you here today, such fostering of involvement encompasses contacts on several fronts—the public libraries and the citizen, the school libraries and the parent, the university library and the faculty member, the informational specialist and the consumer. A network of library service must meet the needs of the public, and that public must contribute. We can't plan and market any enterprise in the vacuum of the board room, regardless of whether it's the board room of the governing body of the city, the public library board, the school board, the board of regents, a private board, or even the City Manager and his staff.

From my own experience in Dallas, I believe the success of the Dallas Public Library comes from the baseline. It's created, approved, funded, and enjoyed by local participants, and it's based on planning and promoting and building over a long period of time. In Dallas, we believe public library service is an essential, not a luxury; and it's going to be a part of that central community of the future.

I close with the urging that we join the public and private sector on behalf of our efforts in library services. Librarians must get out from behind their desks and become active in the community at large, become influence-makers on civic committees and policy-making boards and community groups in the private sector.

Citizens must be encouraged to discuss library services with appointed and elected officials. One has so much to offer the other. And citizens must be offered the opportunity, even encouraged, to participate far beyond the deciding that I mentioned a moment ago, to participate more importantly in the work of the library.

The 21st Century will require the associations I've discussed, but it will produce the service program wanted and needed by the people. It will make the library an essential service in the essential city in the new world. There is nothing more local than a library, nothing so tailored or personalized—the library, in many ways, is the city. And it will be a better future, in the future.

In one of your recent American Library Association publications, I was particularly impressed to read, "Shaped as much by those who use them as by those who serve in them, American libraries will be a mirror of our society's achievement, as well as its potential." In this age of change and diversity and stress and need for adjustment, it's important that all of us work together to see that this does happen. A joint partnership with your local municipal representatives may be something like a marriage, in that all such partnerships, like marriages, aren't made in heaven—but, like a good marriage, it's worth working for to get.

November 18, 1979: Luncheon Session

Remarks of Ralph Nader

MR. NADER: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, you're here this week to discuss something that can be elusively abstract, unless it's made more concrete. It can also be elusively forgettable.

Information is power. Unless it's viewed as an instrument and reflection of power, I fear that we might get too immersed in the emphasis on the new technology, the new software, and the new possibilities, without involving people, name groups, and corporations in what has been over the years a very successful power struggle by, not surprisingly, those who have power.

When I was at law school, I began to look at the reasons why the law overwhelmingly ascribed responsibility to drivers in crashes and injuries on the highway. One of the reasons, and perhaps the most important reason, is that the law reflected the availability of information about traffic crashes. That information was almost exclusively focused on driver neglect, driver sleepiness, driver drinking—and very little was focused on the role of the vehicle, the engineering aspects of vehicle crashes and injuries, as well as the role of the highway. So a sort of vicious circle occurred, because the law relied on a very narrow information base. Lawyers dealt with that information base, and the lawsuits revealed driver-to-driver combat situations, while the vehicles on the highway were almost totally neglected. The cases were built up in terms of precedents, then found their way into the law school case books, and another generation of law students learned it that way.

Now, why was there so little information about automobile deficiencies and highway deficiencies, is a question I asked then. It was quite clear that if information was publicly available, the allocation of responsibility would not focus simply on the driver, but would begin focusing on the highway and the vehicle.

Those were the days when there were no recalls, when General Motors was believed to be able to do no wrong. We now know, of course, that the vehicle's tires, brakes, handling systems, and lack of crash-worthiness were very much related to death and injury on the highway, and that even if drivers were negligent, were involved in a crash, that the crash could be survived if the vehicle was built for safety. Now we see shoulder harnesses, seat belts, padded dash panels, collapsible steering columns, and the air bag coming up in the 1980's, all to try to rescue, at the last possible minute, the motorist from going into steel, plastic, or glass. With the disclosure of this information, because of congressional hearings, it was quite clear that the responsibility had to be shared and differentiated between manufacturers of motor vehicles, drivers, and highways.

It was really interesting that when some of us had obtained this information in the late 1950's and the 1960's, that it was very difficult to get it out to the public, because the newspapers and magazines had no tradition of discussing or reporting information that talked about brand-name cars. When I was working on the Corvair issue, for example, for a few months the newspapers would timidly refer to it as a middle-sized rear-engine American car. They didn't want to call it what it was. Now that taboo is broken. Why? Because the information that was obtained from a few engineering studies, patent reports, and medical school studies about unsafe cars was taken to the congressional arena, and because there were congressional hearings. The media felt that they could report it, and nobody could call up and say, "Hey, what are you doing?"

In short, the lesson is the following: government money funded research at a number of universities on auto design failures. The reports were put out in extremely technical fashion and with very little publicity thrust behind them, because the researchers didn't want to make waves. They just wanted to continue to get grants, and put out technical reports. There was no bridge between the technical reports and Main Street, USA. That bridge was built when Congress conducted a hearing and the national press, nightly news, and national magazine covered it. Then the legislation was passed, and the standards are being issued and implemented, although not as fast as they should.

Why did it take so long? The equipment that was put on cars in the late 1960's, which is now saving thousands of lives in crashes, was available anywhere from 20 to 45 years before that, and not just in theoretically described patents. As a matter of fact, some of the principles were as old, if not older, than Archimedes, who, among some of his unconscious contributions, gave GM a great deal of lead time, which it didn't take.

Now, this information did not start getting out until it was viewed as a power struggle, until it became controversial. While there may be other ways to achieve our goals in the information dissemination world, it's a pretty good idea to ask the questions about monopolizations of power and how controversy, which is the lifeblood of democratic dialogue, can be deliberately generated. There's nothing to be ashamed of in generating controversy. That's what gets people thinking. And in getting controversy generated, based on the facts and value systems that have to be applied and recognized, we get down to naming names.

The experience as a law student made me interested in information policy in government, and we did a great deal of work to try to get the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act passed in recent years. Again, you see, it was a real power struggle. I mean, who could be against Freedom of Information, outside of Washington, D.C.? Plenty of people. One veteran lawyer once described to us his greatest talent. He said, "I get information a few hours earlier than most people." Information is power.

The companies in this town who have lobbying offices spend a great deal of time trying to suppress information, or trying to make sure that it is obtainable only by people who can hire lawyers and pay them thousands of dollars. Right now, for example, Congress is considering a greater trade secrecy imposition on the information that the Federal Trade Commission gets from the drug industries and the oil industries and the medical profession, and others.

The Freedom of Information Act represented a shift in power, aided and abetted by the Watergate scandal, no doubt, but still reflecting the demand by people that they don't want a government that has files on them, and keeps these files secret from the very people whose names are on the file. Unlike any country in the world, we now can write the FBI and the CIA, and have a better chance of getting personal files than any citizens in other countries. While the FBI and CIA may not be fully disclosing these files, the fact that people have a right to them is going to have an effect on the future.

Let me run through a few examples on information as power. Back in the 1930's, the asbestos companies, such as Johns-Manville Corporation, knew about the dangers of asbestos to workers. They kept quiet. As a result, according to Professor Selikoff, there will be 200,000 or more people dying in the next 20 years from asbestos contamination. Thus, lack of flow of information is a life and death issue.

It's a life and death issue in our ghettos, as well. How long ago did the paint manufacturers and others know about lead-based paint? How long ago did people in official capacities in the cities know about ghetto children's practice of peeling off the paint from their tenement walls and eating and poisoning themselves? A long time ago. But action didn't start until the victims, such as a group in New York City, began organizing, and began demanding that this information be brought out. Again, it was a few public health people putting out their technical reports—and a small audience, connecting up with the victims, organizing and reaching a much larger audience. It's that concentric circle of audiences, larger and larger and larger, with each group having a role to play, that must reflect the metabolism of this whole effort.

Chemical waste dumps—let's see if information flow here is a life and death issue. Ask the people at Love Canal, at Niagara Falls, who unwittingly moved into houses, 350 of them, raised their families, above one of the deadliest chemical waste dumps in North America, including dioxin, an ounce of which in water could kill a million people. Hooker Chemical Company, which filled that chemical waste dump, in the 1950's, paved it over, sold it to Niagara Falls for a dollar, and did not tell the city and the community what was underneath. As a result, over the years, birth defects, people getting sick in mysterious ways, the stuff seeping into cellars, into children's playgrounds—finally, Hooker Chemical owned up, came to Washington and testified. "Why?" a member of Congress asked the executive from Hooker Chemical, "Why didn't you disclose this information?" Answer: "Because we were afraid of being sued."

So the flow of information is a life and death issue, particularly now that there are some 40,000 chemical waste dumps around the country, which are just being located in terms of the public access to this information—near water systems, near residential areas, near schools, some of them only a few feet from college dormitories.

Another illustration—campaign contributions. It's interesting that in a society that puts such a great premium on private ownership, we have obstructed the public's right to know who owns our Senators and Representatives. Indeed, we can't even find out who leases them these days.

Well, now, more and more, the information is becoming available, but where? It's very inaccessible. It's so inaccessible that there are people in Washington, full time, who are getting the information from the public files and trying to disseminate them in as small a way as they can. This should be available at the push of a button.

You want to see who you're going to vote for? You dial a number, or you get a printout, or you go to the library, and it's there. And it's there in much greater detail than it is now on the public record, which brings up another problem of how you put the information in shape before it's disseminated.

Recently we were involved in getting the Community Reinvestment Act through Congress. It tells people in the community about the money they go and put in their community banks, savings and loans, and other banks; that they are entitled to know where the money is invested, if at all, in their community. This Act requires that the banks inform the community of their mortgage lending locales, so people can say, "Wait a minute—we're putting the money in the bank, and you're not bringing it back into the community. You're redlining our community, and this leads to further deterioration of our community and our home values. Then the insurance companies come along and begin to redline too; and before we know it, we've lost our community."

Again, information is very critical to those kinds of issues, because they involve a shift of power. If you've got the information, you're going to have more power to challenge the banks on the redlining issue.

And the handicapped. For years, we've been trying to get information on one of the cruelest consumer impacts of all. Sometimes you can test the morality of institutions like corporations by asking, "How do they treat the weakest people, the most vulnerable people in the society?" And look at the way corporations treat people who have to have prosthetic devices, or wheelchairs, and the unconscionably high prices and deficient designs of these life-necessary equipments. There's a wheelchair produced by one company in England—it's more than twice the price in this country! Getting that kind of information out began to stimulate the Organization of Disabled People, and of course it was a two-way street. They demanded it, and they got more of it. But it still has hardly made a dent in these critical areas, because, once again, the basic information is not readily available. It requires not only dissemination, it requires the power of law to get this information to show price-fixing, product-fixing, and other illegal activities.

We must emphasize that, even if you have a distribution system that's very accessible and free, you've got to have legal processes and citizen organizations and research to produce the information. Although we have an enormous amount of information yet to be disseminated, there are many areas where the information is quite inadequate, or not understandable even if it is disseminated.

Take the issue that's now increasing controversy—the Educational Testing Service multiple choice standardized test. For years students have been willing to be judged by a testing system that was, in reality, not objective, not scientific, and not predictive. Here is an institution, the Educational Testing Service, with more than 80 percent of the market, which defines what aptitude and intelligence are. Then, through the exaggerated acceptance of its test scores by admission officials at colleges and universities, it proceeds to allocate the educational opportunities and career roles of millions of people.

That is power. If a government agency had that much power, there would be a revolt against it. But it isn't a government agency, it's a private institution in Princeton, New Jersey, which does this. It has more customers in a year than Ford's and General Motors' new car customers combined. For years, the basis for these tests and questions was not available to their victims, the students. For years, the questions themselves, and the answers, were not available, except once in 1972 when the bar exam tests were revealed publicly, and two law professors who ran the coaching courses for the bar exam for the law school graduates here in Washington, D.C., took the test, and disagreed on 25 percent of the questions.

The validity studies, which in effect are supposed to predict how students will perform educationally, were not disclosed after the test scores came in to be evaluated. The students decided to say, "Enough of this; enough of this secrecy. We're going to get an information flow going." By a coordinated lobbying effort in Albany, culminating in a law, Truth in Testing, signed by Governor Carey in July, starting in 1980 the test scores, the questions, and the answers, will have to be made public, as well as the validity studies. So now teachers, educators, parents, students, and others outside the tight circle of the ETS family can look over this major measuring rod of the future opportunities of students.

And what do these tests test? They do not test individuals' creativity, idealism, judgment, experience, wisdom, determination. We are a specialized, highly industrial society, and as a result the students' curriculum tends to be shaped increasingly in anticipation of the multiple choice standardized test. There is less emphasis on writing the English language, perhaps less emphasis even on reading. I mean, with spatial relations, why do you need to know how to read? All you need to know is how to roll your eyes just right.

This information flow is beginning to shift power to the consumers of multiple-choice testing, to challenge the basis for this form of testing. Why is it given such an exaggerated significance? To what extent does it degrade the premium which should be put on what students have done, in contrast to what they have marked in a three-hour time-pressure morning in October or April; or on other attributes of the students, which now have no entrance value because they don't come under the multiple-choice rubric?

Well, the battle goes on. The Truth in Testing law was passed, and now there are forces trying to repeal it. Some of the administrators of the test are saying they're going to pull out of New York, because they can't make up new questions fast enough—which, of course, is belied by internal records of ETS itself, which will soon be made available.

The New York State Commissioner of Education himself, Gordon Ambach, has testified against the bill, and is going to make sure that the regulations under the bill are such as to vitiate this law. This is something which has to be much more open, and much more open to focus. It is not enough that the questions and answers and the validity studies are going to be on file at the New York State Department of Education. They have to be reproducible by people who can go and make copies at a relatively inexpensive price, not just to go and look at them and be prohibited from copying them down.

The importance of information flow as a system of power has to relate to specific policy questions that are coming up for us right now in the U.S. Government. Number one, the U.S. Census has become an information tool for business, but not very much an information tool for citizens. It's also an information tool for government administrators. People in neighborhoods who want to organize around certain causes should be able to get the kind of information, on a neighborhood basis, that the Census Bureau is able to obtain and make public—the demographic information and the like, which means that some of the census tracts have to be redesigned to correlate with actual neighborhoods. In the past, we have tried to get the Census Bureau to pay more attention. They've recognized the need for it, but I guess they have enough trouble just getting out the Census in the next few months to pay much attention to it. But it's really important—this is the major public information-gathering system we have, and we should pay more attention to it.

Secondly, the Government Printing Office. Here is a classic illustration which libraries should note—boredom as a camouflage device. Any time someone tells you that an institution is boring, watch out, because that is its main defensive weapon. It is so boring that nobody wants to look into it. The People's Printer, that's what it was supposed to be when it was set up in the Civil War period. And it's a long ways from that. Well, we put out this report, and I remember I was trying to get reporters interested in it, and they said, "What, the GPO?"

Well, the GPO is the Printing Office, the distributor, and has a lot to distribute. But its prices have been skyrocketing. I grew up on the GPO. I used to get reports for a dime, fifteen, twenty cents. The baby care pamphlet, which was 20 cents a few years ago, is now $1 or more. Congressional Record prices quadrupled in the last few years. They say it's due to paper price increases—well, part of that is true, but part of it is that the Congress is pressuring the GPO to be a pay-as-you-go situation. And that, to me, is contrary to the entire inspirational philosophy of the Government Accounting Office. It is not to be a pay-as-you-go. It is to be a service, perhaps not free, but it is to be a service.

It also should be a defender of the reader's interests. It should bargain in a tougher way with the cartel known as the paper industry. After all, it's a big buyer of paper. It should develop a remainder situation. I was shocked to hear, a few years ago, that they shred reports when the number of orders falls below a certain level. So in 1971 they shredded 3,000 copies of a tremendous compendium on the automobile industry, put out by the Senate Small Business Committee. Of course, they don't promote these. No wonder there are no orders. They even shredded hundreds of copies of the Special Prosecutor's Report on the Watergate Scandal, because they said nobody was demanding it. Well, why don't you put out a remainder? Why don't you say, "Anybody wants to pay postage, we'll ship them out free?" They haven't done that. Every week, they are destroying important publications—not just ones that are legitimately obsolete and have to be replaced with updated substitutes, but important information which will be out of print probably forever, except for the few libraries that may have been lucky enough to obtain and keep them.

The Federal Government's information policy has got to be an issue of very high visibility. The way to do it is to relate it to the pressing needs of individuals all over the country in their respective roles, whether they're consumers or taxpayers or tenants or disabled people or minority groups. It has to relate to their special needs.

You see, nothing ever happens in terms of citizen action unless there are issues of justice and injustice within the particular subject that is being considered. Information policy and information services have exuded too much of a technical appearance—that it's primarily just learning what's available. It's got to be given the lifeblood of the classic struggles between competing power groups, between perpetrators and victims, because that's what it's all about. People keep information from other people, in order to control them more. If you have to adjust your behavior to certain standards that are established by technical standards groups, or Educational Testing Service, and you don't have the information to challenge and review these standards, you're going to be a prisoner of these standards. So it has to involve the texture of these kinds of struggles.

The oldest form of exchange in human history is barter, where people came out of two caves and exchanged things. Now, because of computer systems that are available, barter is coming back. But it isn't simply A bartering with B, but A feeding information about what A wants to barter into a computer information system, along with B, C, D, E, F, G, etc., and all kinds of connections can be made. So here you have the old-fashioned system of exchange coming back—there's about $250 million a year now in barter, and growing—both between businesses and between consumers, because of increasing deployment of the computer technologies.

What does that tell us? It really tells us that the question of who determines the democratic use, or the non-democratic use, of information technology is a top-agenda item.

I once spoke with some computer people on the West Coast, and I said, "You know, I've heard all about what you're doing. But there's one consistent theme to all your hardware, and that is that it is all aligned on the selling side of the economy, not on the consumer side." I said, "Why don't you develop consumer information systems, such as data about different prices of insurance policies, auto insurance policies, or different effectiveness of detergents, or different durabilities of safety of cars, and then provide it as a service?"

And they said, "Well, you certainly don't think we haven't thought of that." I said, "Maybe you have, but why haven't you done it?" And they said, "You can't serve two masters." You see? In other words, they're serving the selling side, with their computer material and software, and they're not about to cross the line and equip with information power, based on brand-name differentiation, consumers, who can reject certain auto insurance policies and certain detergents and certain cars. In just that one reply they showed how clearly information control is very much the power game that is played for a good deal of our gross national product.

Now, how do we get out of this situation? First of all, we should remember that this room right here has been witness in the past to hundreds, if not thousands, of enthusiastic conference-goers, and enthusiastic political party members. They've streamed out the doors, saying what a terrific conference, it was exhilarating, fingering their resolutions, or, in this case, bundling the resolutions. Then, back out in the hustings, the energy seems not to be focused, because what needs to be done is to have an implementation section after you finish the resolutions sections.

And so I hope that, before you disperse all over the country, you will really put the heat on and get the conferences or meetings going to develop what has to come out of this conference, which is a citizen lobby that fans out throughout the country. And the first thing you've got to figure out is what you're going to call the citizen lobby. I would advise you not to call it the Citizen Lobby on Information and Library Service.

In the Freedom of Information fight, there was a slogan that wasn't the best, but it was better—it was called "The Right to Know." Because that, you see, indicates that the right to know is being opposed. It indicates there's a power struggle here. The problem with libraries is they also have had a dull image. You don't think of a librarian on a white horse, moving off into the horizon. And as long as they have a dull image, and an image of worried tranquility, they're going to see this society's support for them decline—and not just because of Proposition 13. To give you an example, when Howard Jarvis was challenged on the consequences of Proposition 13, almost nobody said, "It was your effort that led to the decline of tax support for libraries." They don't think they can make many points that way.

Now, how does this change? First of all, it changes by having controversial people at Friends of the Library meetings and at library convocations. I can give you a list of a lot of controversial people, and you should have a list of controversial people speaking at your library. There is no better way to get home the point of the need for information flow. You also get good newspaper copy.

The second change is that libraries have to reach out more. When they see a chemical waste-dump situation they should take a part in that struggle, to get that information off, both as individual libraries and together. They should demand, for example, that the Environmental Protection Agency, which is collecting the information about 40,000 chemical waste dumps, find a way to make it available, with an exhibit in the libraries. So you have an exhibit in the library, for a week or a month, which in effect says that information is not milk toast. You show pictures of waste dumps, and materials, and addresses where people can go and get information. We need more addresses of groups, so people can go and get information beyond what the library has.

After a whole decade of citizen activity in Washington, finally, a group put together this compendium called, *Periodicals of Public Interest Organizations*. It's just a page on each consumer environmental group, and other groups', publications. This is the type of thing which libraries should have, so that people could look through them and say, "Oh, here are the addresses, and I will send for it." That's a primitive way, to begin. Some day it will go over in an electronic fashion much more efficiently.

You can get the government to supply you with these kinds of exhibits, and these kinds of current topics. For instance, the Department of Transportation would be very happy to work with libraries to supply them with graphic material on new car technology, air bag technology, dealing with traffic safety. And they would love to have that kind of information system. Sometimes they don't even think of libraries, you see, and you've got to make them think of libraries in that context.

To give you an illustration of another perception that has to be developed—in this country the public owns a great deal of property, but we don't control it. The public owns the airwaves; the television and radio companies control it. Workers own half a trillion dollars of pension monies; banks and insurance companies control and invest it their way. Consumers own half a trillion dollars of assets in mutual life insurance, and another half a trillion in savings and loan deposits; but the companies and the banks control it and manage it. The public owns most of the oil and gas which will be found in this country, because it's going to be found on public lands, onshore and offshore; yet the oil companies, under leases that are very inexpensive, control that oil and gas. So the idea is to take what we own, and move to control it.

We can start with the public airwaves. The idea that Morris the Cat has a greater informational contact with 200 million Americans, on the public airwaves, than 200 million Americans have themselves, on those same public airwaves, is an absurdity. Two hundred million Americans can hardly get on television, unless they make a spectacle of themselves before City Hall or something. And a lot of people don't like to have to make a spectacle of themselves.

So together with the National Citizens Committee on Broadcasting and a number of other supportive groups, we have proposed to Congress something very simple. But it's only simple when you clear away certain perceptions. If you don't have the perception that you own the public airwaves, you'll be satisfied with a little Fairness Doctrine here, and a little correction there, and a little ascertainment over there. But if you think you own it, which is true, and that the Federal Communications Commission is leasing this valuable property for a pittance to the television and radio stations—I believe a New York television station pays less than $8,000 a year for its license—then you'll make the proposal which is what we've called the Audience Network Proposal. That is, that either by legislation or by FCC regulation, an audience network is chartered; let's say it's chartered by Congress.

It is a consumer group, open to anybody who wants to join for $5 per year dues—any viewers or listeners, whoever in the country wants to join. It is organized on a local and a national basis. It has a proficient staff of programmers, reporters, and others to fill up one hour of prime time a night on every radio and television station. This congressionally-chartered audience network would get back one hour of its property, so that this great communications system of ours can reflect diversity and values and controversy and taboo subjects which are now not getting on television these days. Give us back one hour of our property, so that we, an open, accessibie audience group, can program it.

This is very important for your particular purposes, because you've got to step back and dig in, in order to go forward. How are we going to achieve the public literacy that we're talking about concerning the new technology and its availability? How are we going to reach people? How do you pull yourself up by your own bootstraps if you don't have access to a mass communications system? It's the audience network concept that will give you that.

In St. Louis, a media coalition group has already developed, based on labor, neighborhood, community, and consumer groups. They have met with the television-radio broadcast executives, and they've got a little manual on how you can form your own media coalition group.

The second instrument of citizen organization, in terms of shift of power in this area, is an information cooperative. Some of you may not know that in a few days or weeks the National Consumer Cooperative Bank will open its doors. Created by Congress, signed into law in August, 1978, this is one of the few great victories of the consumer movement and the farmer co-op movement in recent years. This bank will be able to extend loans and technical assistance to all kinds of consumer co-ops—the traditional ones, such as health co-ops, housing co-ops, food co-ops, repair co-ops, and the new ones, such as energy co-ops, and information and communication co-ops. What you should do is try to develop a series of proposals, or sit down with the bank's staff in a few weeks, to see what the opportunities are.

The information co-op can be the fundamental, bedrock co-op of them all; it is what spreads the information about other co-ops, among other things. As some of you may have heard, there's a small group in New York that's trying to develop a long-distance telephone co-op, using the new technological opportunities. That is tremendously exciting—the grass root, funded, operating consumer group, focusing on information access and flow. It can be connected with libraries or with other more established institutions, probably to a great mutual advantage.

The third point is the Friends of the Library and library support groups. The American Library Association needs to hire one or two people who have a long history of success in organizing agitation, so they can develop a hard-core group in each community to focus on the Senators and Representatives who will war-whoop, without thinking, a $35 billion, obsolete, nonsense mass transit system for MX missiles; but they will cut down, or give a real hard time, to a fraction of the amount of money for libraries.

If you don't have information systems, people won't know what a complete white elephant monster the MX missile mass transit system is. Mass transit for missiles ahead of people; and it doesn't even work. The Trident submarine now runs roughly $1.4 to $1.5 billion a submarine. It's a new submarine that can destroy 400 cities. It's replacing a smaller sub which could only destroy 100 cities. What is the annual Federal support for libraries? It's a lot less than a Trident submarine. A Martian visiting this country would never believe it.

We can go on later, at greater length, in terms of the libraries' support groups, but they really have got to become much more a part of the ferment and the movement in their communities for information materials. When there's a fight about city hall being secretive on something, the libraries should take a role. They should go to the citizens' groups and say, "We can make this information accessible." This is something which libraries obviously have not wanted to get involved in, but maybe if they have a support structure, that can be done by proxy.

Finally, the focus on elementary and high school education. Millions of youngsters are going through school these days, and graduating, and they don't even know how to read. They have absolutely no idea of what citizens and consumer skills are, and that is not accidental. You do not run youngsters through four, eight, 12 years of education or more, and have them come out without any citizen and consumer skills, by accident.

Developing citizen and consumer skills means going into the community to do research. It means interviewing; and it means equating value systems with knowledge, and bridging knowledge to action. It means challenging the analytic skills of young, imaginative minds before they're stilled by traditional education formats. That can be very upsetting to the power structure in a community—and most educational institutions are merely a reflection of the way power is divided beyond the doorways.

The question is, "What can be done, in a rapid fashion to get the students to learn about the new technology, to learn about the important uses of information for developing citizen and consumer skills. I mean, do high school graduates know anything about how to influence Congress? Do they know the various levers of power and access? Do they know how to get information? The same is true with city hall. Do they know anything about the industries that are determining the air and the water they breathe right in their own community? Do they know anything about the tax system? Do they know how to buy anything, or not to buy anything?

Most students don't know anything about nutrition. All of them eat. What do you want to drink? Give me a Coke. What do you want to eat? Give me a hot dog—the pink torpedo. They don't know what's in it, and they're eating it. It's one thing not to know what's going on; it's another thing not to know what's going on, and then swallow it. Your average hot dog is 29 percent fat, 12 percent water, miscellaneous percentages of seasoning and coloring agents (which are going to be banned soon) and debris like rodent remains and things like that, and substandard meat products with low protein, including crushed bone and rope strands. You know, if high school students knew that, they might wonder a bit and might ask questions about nutrition.

These kinds of consumer and citizen skills require an opening to new or old, but unavailable, sources of information; and it can come so beautifully and so quickly and so graphically, through modern technology. So I do hope that some attention will be paid to curriculum expansion, to extracurricular activity, to get a foothold and sort of qualify before it gets into the curriculum pattern itself.

Outside of school, perhaps we would further many of your resolutions if we developed, around the country, consumer clinics and citizen training clinics. Not the kind where you pick up a civics book, open it, and say, "Our Government is divided into three branches, legislative, judicial, and executive." Citizen training clinics like we're developing. And let me tell you, from our preliminary feedback we've seen that people are hungry for this kind of information. They want to know how to do reconnaissance on the local supermarket. They want to know how to analyze property tax records, and see that the big companies are grossly underpaying, and they're paying more than they should be paying. They want to know these things. They want to know about credit and insurance. They come, and they stay the whole day. They're sorry the time is up at 5:00—a whole day of a consumer training clinic.

Not only that, but they have a lot of fun. And perhaps that is the basic discovery, that citizen and consumer training and citizen involvement, such issues that you're confronting this week, are not just a chore. They are a pleasure. They are a privilege. They should be fun.

Participants

Edmund Reggie
Moderator

Simon Newman
Parliamentarian

John Stackpole
Parliamentarian

Duane F. Johnson
Delegate from Kansas

Robert Navarro
Delegate from Texas

William Pearson
Delegate from Vermont

Gordon Ambach
Delegate from New York

Robert Braude
Delegate from Nebraska

Nancy Lorenzi
Delegate from Ohio

Marcus Salazar
Delegate from Oklahoma

Delia Martinez
Delegate from Nevada

Janet London
Delegate from Massachusetts

Howard Dillon
Delegate from Illinois

Presentation of Resolutions

Sunday, November 18, 1979

Proceedings

MR. REGGIE: The meeting is now called to order. By way of introduction, my name is Edmund Reggie. I'm from Louisiana and I will be your moderator this afternoon.

Ladies and gentlemen, with your help and your cooperation, we will have a splendid general session, but we are going to have to depend on your close, close cooperation. With roughly 650 people, if everybody takes a minute, that's a little over 10 hours. So we are going to really need your close, close cooperation.

I think in the spirit of time—because you are all professionals, you have all been working in those theme groups, you know what we're talking about—with your permission we will ask representatives of each theme group to read their priority resolutions and to forego the reading of the preamble or the "whereas" portion. You know what we're talking about, but it will give you a sense of how the problem is being solved. Does that meet with everybody's approval? Is there unanimous consent?

(Applause.)

Is there any objection to handling it like that?

(No response.)

All right, then. Without objection, it is so ordered, and if you notice, we don't give you much chance to object. So, that's what we will do. We will go through all of those resolutions, and I must tell you that we are talking about 34 of them, so we'd better get moving.

At the conclusion, we have asked the staff to give us a list of those petitions that have been filed with resolutions in the initiative procedure so you can be made aware of what you are going to be voting on tomorrow in that regard also.

Before the afternoon is over, you are going to notice there is going to be a lot of similarity in some of the resolutions, as could be expected. If you want your Resolutions Committee to synthesize those, we will ask at a later point in the meeting for a resolution authorizing that synthesizing of the various resolutions to make sure we come up without robbing the general nuances and feelings that are incorporated in any of the resolutions.

So, if that is our ground rule, and with your permission, we will get started. Here is what we are going to do. We are going to ask you to be a little flexible with us. We had really planned to do it in reverse order, to give you those in Theme V, then IV, then III, II, and I, and the reason why we thought of that ingenious idea was because II and I were not yet prioritized and they were running a little late.

Please understand, we are not going to vote on these this afternoon. We are giving you this information so you may formulate your own ideas and thoughts, so you can vote after some cogitation and meditation tomorrow morning at eight o'clock. So motions will not be in order this afternoon.

It is my pleasure to present the two representatives of Theme V who are going to make the presentation of their priority resolutions. From Texas, Mr. Robert Navarro, and from Kansas, Mr. Duane Johnson. I turn the meeting over now to those representatives of Theme V.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Reggie. Theme V is that subject area dealing with increasing international cooperation, and I think it's worth noting that, as all of the theme discussion groups must have been, this was a very complex process, involving a lot of consideration. As much as was humanly possible, the groups involved considered things like national security, copyright laws, questions of ethnocentricity, and other human considerations in all of the processes related to the generation of these particular resolutions.

The rank one priority of the workshop related to the control of Federal international informational activities. The resolved clause is: "Therefore be it resolved, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services recommends that the President instruct that the Office of Management and Budget supply him in this fiscal year with a report outlining: a) which governmental agencies are engaged in these activities, with a tabulation of attendant costs; and b) recommendations to eliminate duplication of effort and waste, and to expand coverage where appropriate. That on the basis of this report, the executive branch formulate the needed procedures for coordinating United States participation in international communication and information programs, both public and private."

Priority two of this theme group relates to overcoming barriers to information on an international scale. The resolved clause: "Therefore be it resolved, that a U.S. congressional commitment be made to provide for an exchange program of library and information personnel, for educational and professional in-service training and experience.

"Be it resolved, that the library and information communities of the United States support the existing programs of Universal Availability of Publications and the elimination of trade and other barriers to the exchange of library materials of all kinds.

"Be it further resolved, that as Federal and State programs for networking are established, consideration for international communication and sharing be included within the framework of the networks which are created.

"Be it further resolved, that information services and the appropriate media be available to all users, including the handicapped.

"Be it further resolved, that funds should be sought for the implementation of international networking and resource sharing through coordinating of existing specialized collections, as well as through other resources."

MR. NAVARRO: The third priority deals with media integration and conversion: "Resolved, that new standards be developed for the creation and use of material in computer processible form; and that individuals, organizations, and agencies creating documents and books and generating other information be encouraged to create these materials in computer processible form in order to decrease the load of retrospective conversion; and that research be funded to develop new technologies that permit convenient and economic media conversion from and to media-like print, microfiche, magnetic, optical, voice, etc."

The fourth ranked priority deals with the low-cost delivery of library materials: "Be it resolved, that a system for rapid low-cost

218

delivery of library materials and information within the United States and its noncontiguous communities, including reduced or subsidized postal and telecommunication rates, must be guaranteed for library benefits.

"Be it further resolved, that the United States should enter into agreements with foreign countries for this same purpose."

MR. REGGIE: Presenting the priority resolutions of Theme IV, we have from the state of Vermont, Mr. Wink Pearson, and from the state of New York, Mr. Gordon Ambach.

MR. PEARSON: Thank you. The theme session of Theme IV looked for ways that we could use our libraries and information services to more effectively govern our society. The session passed 19 resolutions, seven of which we put in a priority order, since we had seven work sessions.

The first priority resolution that we had was to establish a national information policy with certain elements: "Be it resolved, that there be proclaimed and implemented a National Information Policy which includes provisions:

"1) to guarantee all citizens equal and full access to publicly funded library and information services;

"2) to ensure government agencies at all levels work together to make available all new and existing library and information services to the maximum extent possible;

"3) to redress all past imbalances in providing library and information services to minorities, underserved, and special needs;

"4) to ensure that technology not be a barrier to full access to all information;

"5) to support the cultural diversity of our society by making available information on our different cultures and heritages; and

"6) to protect the privacy of all segments of our society, including personal privacy, economic privacy, and national security."

The second resolution in priority order went to the purpose of establishing a voice in the new United States Department of Education at the Assistant Secretary level. I believe there are quite a few resolutions in other groups that touched on this issue: "Be it resolved, that the Office of Library and Information Service be established within the United States Department of Education at a level with no less authority than that of an Assistant Secretary.

"That a representative from this White House Conference on Library and Information Services testify to that need before the Congressional hearing on Monday, November 19, 1979.

"That the new Secretary of Education be notified of this Conference resolution, and that the delegates and alternates to this Conference be requested to contact their congressional representatives to encourage support of this resolution."

The third resolution ranked in priority deals with ensuring that our citizenry is informed: "Be it resolved, that public libraries should promote and facilitate the discussion of public issues by all segments of the local community: by acquisition of materials that would present various sides of controversial issues; by supporting discussions and forums on issues; by publicizing widely that these opportunities for community discussions are available; and by educating public officials on the availability and use of information resources."

I would ask you to look, if you need to, at the displays, if that's helpful, because we decided to use those to help you to know what the priority items were. Thank you.

MR. AMBACH: Mr. Chairman and members of the delegate body, the fourth priority ranking for our theme has the title "Networking": "Be it resolved, that Federal legislation should be enacted to promote increased funding for coordinating library networks. The Federal Government should encourage through funding and loan programs coordination of networks at the national level, keyed to state and regional multitype library networks to achieve maximum interlibrary cooperation. It should designate a specific proportion of Federal funds for network operations at the State level and for grants in support of local cooperative action."

The fifth ranking priority for our theme area has the title of "Increasing Federal and State Funding": "Be it resolved, that the White House Conference recognize the urgent need for a reordering of local, State and Federal priorities to respond to the increasing need for excellence and wide use of library and information services, and

"That such reordering must result in improved funding for all types of nonprofit library and information services, with significantly heavier shares borne by State and Federal governments."

Our sixth priority in this theme area, and very particularly related to the issue of citizenship and of responsible participation in government, is a reaffirmation statement about the First Amendment: "Be it resolved, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services affirms its support for the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to guarantee freedom of inquiry, freedom to read, freedom to publish, free and full access to information, especially information about public processes, and the freedom to assemble and discuss in public meetings, all of these freedoms being essential to the maintenance of free libraries and other information sources."

And, finally, our resolution seven in Theme IV, having to do with the Library of Congress and planning functions, again related to governance issues: "Be it resolved, that the Library of Congress be designated by Congress to provide leadership in the development of plans for such services as a national repository for all governmental publications, a national periodicals center, a national referral center, and a national network system, and

"Be it further resolved, that the State library agencies be designated as integral participants in the planning and development of national services and leaders in the planning of State and local services, such as the distribution of governmental information and development of workshops to inform and instruct citizens in the uses of these services."

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. While we are waiting for the Theme III documents to come down, I have the pleasure of presenting to you two gentlemen who are here to serve as parliamentarians. Perhaps you have met them at other sessions, but I have the distinct pleasure of presenting to you a documentation consultant from here in Washington, D.C., Mr. Simon M. Newman.

If you have never met a certified parliamentarian, or a member of the American Institute of Parliamentarians, or a registered parliamentarian, or a member of the National Association of Parliamentarians, you have as great an honor for the first time as I had in meeting him. It's my pleasure to present to you Mr. John B. Stackpole.

Ladies and gentlemen, we do have the petition resolutions that have already been filed. I will discuss them with you to tell you what they are, but we should be very cautious and understand that they didn't have to be filed this early. They have until eight o'clock tonight under the rules you adopted at the beginning of the session on the first evening. So reading them now, or what they purport to do, is not indicative of what we have. It is not what you are going to be voting on tomorrow, nor are we trying to do an injustice to any of those that will be filed by giving those that are filed any kind of unfair advertisement or exposure. Is there any objection to following that procedure?

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. "Be it resolved, that: 1) a White House or a Federal Conference on Library and Information Services be held every decade to establish the national information goals and priorities for the next decade, to assure effective transfer of knowledge to citizenry, and to accomplish this goal in light of accelerated changes in information, technology, and practices; and 2) an interim Conference be held every five years under the aegis of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to assess the national progress made in implementation of the recommendations of the preceding national Conference and the progress in providing library and information services to the citizenry, and to project further improved services in the light of national needs."

Here is another: "Resolved, that the White House Conference recognize the urgent need for a reordering of local, State and Federal priorities to respond to the increasing need for excellence and wide use of library and information services.

"That such reordering must result in improved funding for all types of nonprofit library and information services, with significantly heavier shares borne by State and Federal governments.

"That Study Bill S.1124 be developed into a strong National Library Act, giving impetus and sustenance to this reordering of priorities and reallocation of resources, and providing substantial response to the major specific library and information service needs which may be subject to Federal assistance.

"That a structure of responsibility be confirmed by the White House Conference for effective follow-through with this development." That one would be called "Approved by the Pennsylvania White House Conference Delegation."

The next one is the "Connecticut Delegation to the White House Conference on Libraries": "Resolved, that the library in America be given a predominant presence everywhere in the Nation by the creation of an Assistant Secretary of Libraries in the U.S. Department of Education."

The next one is submitted by Edward Weldon, at-large delegate from the Society of American Archivists: "Resolved, that Congress is requested to renew the authorization for funding the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and to increase the funding for this Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities, so that their essential contributions for preserving and making accessible the historical records of the Nation can be continued and expanded."

Can we get started with Theme III? Can you share with somebody near you? If you can, we can get you out of here earlier. Is that all right?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: We are pleased to present to you the two representatives from Theme III who will make their presentation of priority resolutions. From the State of Nebraska, Mr. Bob Braude, and from the State of Ohio, Ms. Nancy Lorenzi.

MR. BRAUDE: Theme III was concerned with improving information for organizations and the professions. Ours are not ranked in any particular priority order. We only had four. We thought it was a little redundant to establish priorities for four resolutions.

The first one concerns the Assistant Secretary: "Be it resolved, that there be an appointment of an Assistant Secretary for Library and Information Services, reporting directly to the Secretary of Education, who shall administer all grant programs currently administered by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources and shall establish communications with all Federal programs related to library and information services."

The second resolution concerns networking and equal access to information: "Be it resolved, that a comprehensive approach be taken to the planning and development of multitype library and information networks and programs, including both profit and not-for-profit libraries from the public and private sector; and be it further resolved, that plans be developed for the coordination of such library and information networks and programs; and be it further resolved, that mechanisms be developed to ensure access by all individuals in organizations and professions to such networks and programs."

MS. LORENZI: The third issue deals with establishing and implementing standards: "Therefore be it resolved, that the Federal Government direct all federally supported libraries and information services and other appropriate Federal agencies to support the development, review, and adoption of national and international standards for publishing, producing, organizing, storing, and transmitting information in the fields of library and information services, utilizing established and recognized procedures.

"Be it further resolved, that high priority attention be given to establishing or extending standards which address hardware and software compatibility, computer and communications network protocols, and machine readable information.

"Be it further resolved, that the private sector be encouraged to participate and to support the development of such standards.

"Be it further resolved, that the Federal Government direct all Federal libraries, publishing and information services, and similar federally supported activities to play an exemplary role in the acceptance and use of established standards.

"Be it further resolved, that the Federal Government support activities which lead to broader understanding and adoption of established standards throughout the Nation."

The next issue is to retain Federal funding levels for present library programs: "The library interests at this Conference appreciate that we have been told that we have a friend in the White House, and we call upon the Administration and the Congress to fund at current authorized levels the Library Services and Construction Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act and the National Library of Medicine's library programs in the next budget year." Thank you.

MR. REGGIE: If we can get back to some of those resolutions that were filed by petition.

The one from the American Library Association is: "Be it resolved, that Congress consider and approve legislation directed to library services which meet the needs of ethnic groups in America."

Another one is presented by the deaf caucus. It is not exactly in a resolution form; however, I know that at least one section that I participated in earlier picked it up as a resolution. But this is pretty much what you would call, I guess, the resolution section.

On the State level: "To train personnel in library service to the deaf; to establish a Library Commission for the Deaf which will include deaf individuals; to establish a clearinghouse that will act as a sole information and referral in the State to assist all libraries to serve the deaf and the general public on information needs about deafness and services for the deaf, a storeplace for collection of special media for the deaf for interlibrary loan."

And on the national level: "To enact a National Library Service for the Deaf. The service shall be developed and devised by a board consisting of deaf professionals, deaf consumers, and library professionals."

I think that takes us through the resolutions that we have filed.

A PARTICIPANT: Maybe during the time we have to wait you can give us the procedure for discussion of amendments and voting on the resolutions.

MR. REGGIE: All right, we will get to that. I think it is a good idea, but I do want to recognize this lady.

A PARTICIPANT: Point of information. The Maryland delegation, under my name, had submitted a resolution with 150 signatures on implementation. Since it did not come up on your list, I am wondering if it was ruled out for some reason of technicality. We still have a few hours to develop it a second time.

MR. REGGIE: All I can say about it is, I was handed these. There was one on the back of one page which may be yours: "Be it resolved, that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science convene an Ad Hoc Committee, composed of delegates elected by each delegation to the White House Conference. The Ad Hoc Committee shall be responsible for planning and monitoring conference follow-up activities."

THE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. That is it.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. I'm glad you called it to my attention. It was on the back of a page and I just missed it.

A PARTICIPANT: When will the other theme areas, other than the seven priority issues, be taken up?

MR. REGGIE: They will be taken up tomorrow on a paper ballot, but they will not have discussion time.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, could I respectfully request that you check the backs of the other ones, because there was a resolution that had a hundred and some odd signatures submitted by the youth caucus, and that was not read.

MR. REGGIE: Yes, I found one: "Be it resolved, that this Conference recognizes the urgent need to formulate information policies for the people of the United States and charges the NCLIS to consult with other agencies and organizations to formulate such policies and propose necessary legislative action." Is that the one to which you made reference?

THE PARTICIPANT: No. This is about the youth on library boards.

MR. REGGIE: Here is the youth one. You should double-check with whoever is in charge of having that lodged or filed, because it may have gone astray. This is not quite in form, but the substance of it is: "We, the youth of the White House Conference, recognize that youth have a negative image of libraries, that there is a general unawareness of many goods and services that the libraries have to offer, and, despite these barriers, youth between the ages of five and 24 continue to make up approximately 40 percent of the library users in the country . . ."

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, point of information. In this period of delay, would it be appropriate to move any of these resolutions?

MR. REGGIE: No, sir, not at this time, because it is a matter of first reading, just for informational purposes.

A PARTICIPANT: We have heard a number of the resolutions from a number of the theme sessions and have recognized that they are quite similar. We have also heard petition resolutions that appear to be quite similar. Therefore, I would like to move at this point, if it is in order, that the Resolutions Committee be directed to synthesize clearly duplicative theme session resolutions and petition resolutions, incorporating into each final product all identifiable elements of the individual resolutions proposed.

MR. REGGIE: I appreciate that motion very much, because I was going to ask for it. Since we have this lull, would you be kind enough to give us that document that you read, so that we may follow it as a guideline if that resolution does pass? Does anyone want to speak to that resolution at this time?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: It has been moved and seconded that the Resolutions Committee synthesize the approved resolutions and present them tomorrow morning for adoption in their synthesized versions.

A PARTICIPANT: Will we be allowed to amend tomorrow?

MR. REGGIE: Yes.

THE PARTICIPANT: We were not allowed to do that today in our sessions.

MR. REGGIE: Yes.

MS. EASTMAN: Mr. Reggie, Ann Eastman from Virginia. While we're on this matter of the duplicative resolutions, how do we handle the adjustments and account for theme area in working with the final resolutions on the floor tomorrow? That is, Themes I and II will have a larger number of resolutions than Themes III, IV, and V, because fewer groups discussed the topics.

MR. REGGIE: We are going to take all 34. I think they may wind up being 33, because in Theme I there was a consolidation. I think that we may wind up with 33 or 34 at the outside.

MS. EASTMAN: I know three groups that have put through the suggestion that there be an Office of Library and Information Services and an Assistant Secretary of Education. If you combine those three into one substantive resolution, that leaves two open-slots.

MR. REGGIE: They won't be charged to any one group. At that point, it will be coming out of the Resolutions Committee to the floor. They lose their identity as having belonged to a certain theme, as I understand it.

MS. EASTMAN: I'm asking for clarification.

MR. REGGIE: That is the way we would like to handle it tomorrow. In other words, the theme identity will no longer exist. It will be a matter for the Conference to adopt.

MS. EASTMAN: You will bring to us probably 34 resolutions?

MR. REGGIE: Plus those that have come up on an issue.

MS. EASTMAN: Thank you.

MR. REGGIE: There is a motion. It has been duly seconded that the Resolutions Committee be directed to synthesize clearly duplicative theme session resolutions and petition resolutions, incorporating into each final product all identifiable elements of the individual resolutions proposed. Are you ready for the question?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Unless there is objection, we will call for the vote.

A PARTICIPANT: Just a point. When will we have those in hand synthesized?

MR. REGGIE: Tomorrow morning at voting time. Here we go with the voting. As many of you as are in favor of the motion as just read, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, please say no.

(No response.)

There being none in the negative, we will show that it passes unanimously.

(Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, the Chair recognizes Ms. Patricia Wright.

MS. WRIGHT: First, I would like to say that the position paper that the Chairman started to read was also very important, and we all hope that you took notice of that. But the particular resolution that was presented by the youth caucus reads as follows: "Be it resolved, that there be at least one youth appointee named to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a voting member, and that States be encouraged to include youth on their library boards as voting members, and that local governments be encouraged to include at least one youth as a voting member on the local library board." Thank you.

MR. CHITLIK: Mr. Chairman, point of information. Paul Chitlik from the California delegation. I am very curious to know what the agenda is for the rest of the afternoon. If the Resolution Committee is going to be synthesizing the resolutions, what are we going to be doing?

MR. REGGIE: We hope that you are going to be learning what those resolutions are, as we would in any deliberative body at first reading. We just won't get you unaware, then. That was the reason for having it done this way. We should have those documents here momentarily.

However, if we can cover another very important subject, it will cut down on our time tomorrow morning. The young lady here asked a while ago about our voting procedure in the morning. So we might as well cover that, because we have a little time now; and we won't in the morning, because we will be pushing, with that many resolutions.

As the first order of our business tomorrow, we are going to take up the resolutions that have been passed by the various theme groups. After them will come the initiative resolutions.

Next, they will be presented by a reader. We are hopeful that you will agree that we can do it like we did this afternoon, without the preamble "Whereas," but just from the resolution paragraphs where you call for some action. We are going to ask you for that approval in the morning. The reader will read that portion.

I will be presiding, if all goes well, and we will ask for a discussion or for a vote. If you like the way it was synthesized, or you like the way it was presented without being synthesized, and there is nothing else to be added, we will go ahead and adopt it. If, however, you want to amend it, or change it or do some other playing around with it, the Chair will be open to that.

I do want to ask your cooperation in that regard, because I am certain that the finest word to describe an activity or an action won't be used. I'm sure that many of you will have a better word to be used, or a better phrase to be used, or a better term to be used, and I am sure that we will use something that you would rather us not have in the resolution. But we are reasonable men and women, and we are going to have to depend upon the reasonableness of all of the delegates in that regard. We are not going to be able to satisfy everyone 100 percent, but that is not to say that we are going to run a great big steamroller. At times you will think that I am running a steamroller, but I am not going to really try to stop debate or discussion.

The other point that I would like to make is that we are dealing with a group of very erudite and knowledgeable people in the field that we are discussing, and we will be voting on the resolutions at the end of the discussion. All of us have had exposure to this subject for several days, besides attending our State conferences. So it won't be necessary for us to hear from every proponent or opponent of an amendment or of a measure. Unless you want to say something that you feel has some extra quality of interest that no one else probably thought about, we will ask you to let the case stand on its own merits. Because we are going to need a spirit of brevity very, very badly.

If we are able to synthesize 34 down to 24, which we might be able to do—if we are able to merge them—and then if we are going to have 20 by initiative, that is going to give us 44 resolutions between eight and 11 o'clock. We don't have a flexible amount of time, because at 11 o'clock they are going to commence congressional hearings. So, you see, we are boxed in. We should all understand that. That, again, is one of the reasons why we wanted to have this period tonight, so we would all understand the rules and you would also understand, with me, the necessity of our starting on time tomorrow morning.

A PARTICIPANT: Would the Chair, in the interest of time, entertain a motion that we pass on the issue of only presenting the resolution part?

MR. REGGIE: The question is: "Would the Chair now want to make a rule for tomorrow morning that we present only the 'Resolved' portion of the resolution?" What is your pleasure?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Well, if you want to cover that, we can get that far ahead.

THE PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I make that motion.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: It has been moved and seconded that the presenters tomorrow do it in the same fashion that they did today;

that is, that they give only the "Resolved" portion of the resolution and leave the preamble "Whereas" off. Is there any discussion on the motion?

A PARTICIPANT: I think that would be all right for the ones that we have in our hands, but we won't have the initiatives.

MR. REGGIE: You will know what the topics are. The resolution will have its own.

A PARTICIPANT: I would like to know if there will be a copy provided that does include the "Whereas."

MR. REGGIE: Yes. Every copy that you have in hand will. Only the presenter will eliminate that.

THE PARTICIPANT: Then how will those who cannot read know about the combined "Whereas?"

MR. REGGIE: We would hope that a reader would be able to accommodate them on that.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I believe there are facilities available to tape-record these resolutions, and I do not feel that a reader is appropriate. I feel that the people who are not print readers ought to be able to listen to the tape. There are facilities available to do this.

MR. REGGIE: I stand corrected. That was what the solution was, rather than readers. You are correct on that, and I stand corrected.

A PARTICIPANT: Point of order. We have an amendment on the floor.

MR. REGGIE: We have a motion on the floor to allow the readers tomorrow morning to read only the resolution paragraphs. Are you ready to vote on that?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to voting?

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, one caveat. There is a possibility on resolutions that we have not had, that there may be some disconnection or not contiguous thought that should be put into the "Resolved." With that caveat, I would like to see if some mechanism could be done to recognize if it could be better tied in.

MR. REGGIE: I think if that is noted in the morning, we can certainly make an exception and have it inserted as an amendment or a correction. After all, we want to get the job done. That's what we really are trying to do.

Are you ready for the vote? As many of you as are in favor of the motion that we read in the morning, only the resolution paragraphs of the resolution, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, please say no.

(No response.)

There being none in the negative, we show that it passes unanimously. Thank you for that.

A PARTICIPANT: For purposes of easing tomorrow morning's activities, would you entertain a motion this afternoon to set a time limit on debating a particular motion?

MR. REGGIE: Let me say this. I'm willing to do whatever you want me to do. But I have an idea that with our group and everybody getting along like we understand each other here—and I think that is the way it is going to prevail tomorrow—I don't think we will ever need it. If we start looking like we're getting out of kilter, we'll just stop and back up. We will be frank and honest about it.

Rather than set an iron-clad period of time, I think we can be flexible and do the same job. If it doesn't work, we can entertain that motion in the morning.

(Applause.)

We are going to ask you in the morning to remember that some of your side remarks that you make are not picked up, because they are side remarks; but sometimes they are very important to judge the sense of the meeting. However, they are not picked up by the interpreter, and then those persons who have a deafness condition are unable to pick up those little nuances of knowing what really is going on in the room. So we will ask you in the morning, if you have something to say, to please talk about it at the microphone, where the translator can pick it up and relate those nuances and feelings to those who have that hearing impairment.

(Applause.)

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, would you kindly inform me as to what is about to happen to those resolutions beyond the first set that were approved by each theme group. Are they going to be submitted to this group?

MR. REGGIE: They are going to be submitted to this group tomorrow morning on a paper ballot.

THE PARTICIPANT: It was my understanding that if a resolution beyond number seven had been approved by my group, I could move its adoption. Is that a correct understanding, or do I have to have 100 signatures in order to be able to present it?

MR. REGGIE: You are going to have to have 100 signatures in order to present it, but all of them are going to be presented on a paper ballot for approval. Do you mean you want to bring it back up for oral argument?

THE PARTICIPANT: I just want it to be voted on.

MR. REGGIE: It will be voted on on a paper ballot.

THE PARTICIPANT: Even if I don't have 100 signatures?

MR. REGGIE: You don't need 100 for that. Every one of them.

THE PARTICIPANT: But if I want to bring it up and talk to you, then, logistically, I have to prepare a resolution now and have 100 signatures on it?

MR. REGGIE: Yes, sir.

MS. LAKE: Mr. Chairman, Marilyn Lake from Missouri. Will we have a chance to see these other resolutions, which weren't in the top priorities, for any length of time before we are to vote on them on this paper ballot?

MR. REGGIE: I really don't know. I can't answer that, because it depends on how fast or at what hour of the night they can get them done. We will try to get a ruling for you on those paper ballots by the staff before the meeting adjourns today.

MS. LAKE: Thank you.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. It's a good question.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Chairman, Harry Strong from Virginia. Would you please explain the procedures of the voting on the paper ballots, or let me know where I can read about what that procedure is.

MR. REGGIE: I have not received fully the paper ballot procedure; therefore, at this point I am at a loss to give you any more than I know. All I can tell you at this juncture is that they will be voted upon with a paper ballot tomorrow morning. Other than that, I really can't tell you any more at this stage.

MR. STRONG: I appreciate that. I think the focus of my concern is that going through somewhere around 30 resolutions with discussions and amendments and so forth, which is totally appropriate, will take some time. We have a limited amount of time. What I'm curious about is whether I'm going to sit with another whole mess of resolutions written up in great detail, with little boxes to check off, yes, no, or abstain in my lap, and I'm going to be put into a position of having to check that all off in the last five minutes before a congressional hearing.

MR. REGGIE: I'm sorry. That may be the case, and that is the reason why your resolutions were prioritized.

MR. STRONG: Could I urge you if you have any input into that process to set some time aside so that we can deal with that.

MR. REGGIE: We are going to try, but I can't make a promise. I think the point you make is valid, but I just don't know how we might be able to solve that.

A PARTICIPANT: Did I hear you say before that tomorrow morning we are inflexibly bound to end at 11 o'clock, when the congressional hearings begin?

MR. REGGIE: Yes, ma'am. That's as the program indicates.

THE PARTICIPANT: We were assured by a telephone conversation with Ms. Gell before the Conference that the congressional hearings would be held in another room, so that if it was necessary for the plenary to continue it could, there would be that flexibility if the delegates wanted it.

MR. REGGIE: I'm sure that the delegates run this Conference, and if they want to stay in session until the afternoon—I'm only telling you what the program calls for.

In just a few minutes, you are all going to have the priority resolutions of Theme I in your hands. We are going to have the representatives of Theme I read the portions from the "Resolved" paragraphs. At this time, even at the risk of encroaching a minute before you get them, but to keep the program going, I would like to call on the delegate from the State of Nevada, Ms. Delia Martinez, and the delegate from the State of Oklahoma, Mr. Marcus Salazar.

MR. SALAZAR: This may have come out very appropriately because, as you notice, Theme I had many comments in their resolutions. There are also a couple of items I would like to mention before we get started.

Theme I had two resolutions that dealt with a very particular and special need, the needs of the physically handicapped and the deaf. The delegates from Theme I felt that this was such an important issue, that it had such a special concern for individuals, that these two resolutions were adopted as parts of our resolutions.

One of the things that I will say is that I would like to have your permission when I get to that section to just read a synopsis. You do have the copies before you and the resolutions have been read by the Chairman. If you have any questions about that, I will be glad to take more time with it; but I think the important thing to understand is that Theme I felt like these two particular resolutions had special emphasis and special meanings to populations and, therefore, were combined.

In Theme I, meeting personal needs, the first area is access: "Be it resolved, that barriers to such services, whether legal, fiscal, technical, attitudinal, environmental, cultural, or other barriers, must be eliminated and physical facilities and staff must be capable of providing services to all segments of society; and

"Be it further resolved, that Federal legislation be enacted to guarantee the right of equal access to all publicly held information for all citizens; and

"Be it further resolved, that institutions educating library and information service practitioners assume responsibility to address the needs of said consumers through their training and education; and

"Be it further resolved, that a national public policy to promote universal library and information services be adopted; and

"Be it further resolved, that library and information services be provided these persons through appropriate jurisdiction, Federal, State and local; and

"Be it further resolved, that access restrictions be removed from library materials purchased with Federal funds."

The second resolution deals with funding: "Be it therefore resolved, that:

"1) Congress fund the Library Services and Construction Act and all titles of this Act to provide adequate funding for libraries;

"2) the Federal Government reduce or subsidize postal and telecommunication rates for delivery and/or return of library, informational, and educational materials to include noncontiguous and isolated areas;

"3) Congress establish a funding formula based on population, geography, local participation, and need;

"4) Congress provide new funding for: A) innovative demonstration projects, such as research and community needs assessment projects, cultural awareness projects, and youth incentive projects; B) elementary and secondary school libraries, and certified staff library instruction and media programs; C) college and university libraries;

"5) Congress needs to provide financial support for rural, urban, and economically deprived areas;

"6) the President increase his budget recommendations for library programs."

The third resolution deals with public awareness: "Be it resolved, that in order to accommodate desired increase in public awareness, the following activities, projects, and proposals should be undertaken:

"1) develop and implement an aggressive, comprehensive national public awareness campaign coordinated at the Federal level and involving the following: A) Library Administration Office, United States Department of Education; B) State library agencies; C) local library units; D) national, State, and local Friends of the Library groups; E) ALA and other library-related organizations; F) national, State, and local organizations representative of all segments of society; G) to adopt a national library symbol to be disseminated nationally;

"2) implementation of model or demonstration projects—to be administered and developed by libraries in concert with community organizations—dealing with effective public awareness programs;

"3) the assimilation of libraries into broad-based community projects and programs, utilizing the most effective means of creating public awareness of libraries to all segments of the community;

"4) establishment of policy requiring libraries requesting Federal monies to include effective and viable public awareness programs and activities to publicize programs to intended service recipients;

"5) training of professionals in human relations, effective use of public relations, and marketing techniques necessary to increase public usage of library services;

"6) provision for national, regional, State, and local planning consultants and specialists to be made available to local libraries when needed in order to increase effectiveness of existing and proposed programs;

"7) promote and encourage cooperation with volunteer organizations" (and this is a change) "in the use of trained volunteers." (Strike the word "licensed" and make that "trained.")

"8) formation of planning groups reflective of communities, specifically those segments that are underserved or unserved, to initiate needs assessment and to assist in the development of programs to effectively meet those needs;

"9) utilization of all local, State, regional, and national agencies, organizations, and groups representative of special constituencies in attaining necessary support, political clout, and, simultaneously, providing an instrument for further assessment and increasing awareness."

The fourth resolution is the item that I spoke to. You will find in your packet two documents, and I will not try to read both of those. As I explained earlier, we have been up late finishing these up, and my tongue is still very much asleep, I'm afraid. The first document you have is the resolution that was passed by the physically handicapped group. It was in resolution form, and this committee adopted it in that form. If you will allow yourself to read that, I will dispense from reading all of those items, unless there is a request to do otherwise.

MR. REGGIE: I don't mean to interrupt, but I do want to assure everyone that you will notice in these two resolutions there are some technical points. When they are synthesized, we will positively preserve the technical language that is necessary in each group. You can rest assured of that.

MR. SALAZAR: The second document, if you will flip over about three pages, "Issue: Goal six," and it will be, I guess, subtitled under the area of "Services to the Deaf." The major issues there are very easy to pick out. This document will be combined with the document pertaining to the physically handicapped.

The major items on the deaf are: "Train personnel on library services to the deaf; establish a library committee of the Library Commission for the Deaf which will include deaf individuals; establish a clearinghouse that will act as a sole information and referral in the State to assist all libraries to serve the deaf and the general public on informational needs about deafness and services for the deaf for interlibrary loan." Those were proposed at the State level.

At the national level: "Enact a National Library Service for the Deaf along the lines of the National Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. The service shall be developed and devised by a board consisting of deaf professionals, deaf consumers, and library professionals and lay individuals." Thank you.

MS. MARTINEZ: Our ranking number five was titled "Networking": "Be it resolved, that Federal and State funds be made available to continue to support and interconnect existing networks, as well as develop new networks, until the network is truly national in scope, using compatible technology; and

"Be it further resolved, that the United States Department of Education's Office of Library and Learning Resources, or its successor, should coordinate and facilitate the national network in consultation with States and regions; and

"Be it further resolved, that all agencies and institutions that provide education and continuing education for library practitioners should offer training in the skills, knowledge, and abilities which will help ensure that practitioners are competent to provide access through this network in the most practical, efficient, and empathetic manner."

Our ranking number six was titled "Literacy": "Be it resolved, that Federal funds and State funds, administered by appropriate State and local agencies, be provided to enable libraries to: 1) develop literacy programs; 2) obtain books and other materials suited to the ages, interests, and reading level of participants in literacy programs; 3) provide materials and space for tutorial programs; 4) act as centers for the coordination and support of activities of agencies engaged in promoting literacy."

Ranking number seven, "National Library Act/National Advisory Board": "We endorse the concept of a national library act and urge Congress to schedule regional hearings, with input from a broad based citizenry, to consider its various aspects, with particular emphasis on the following: 1) a definition of libraries; 2) a proposed funding formula; 3) a structure of a national committee or a national advisory board, with representatives from each State or Territory of the U.S., to formulate national information and library policies, that will include both lay and library-related persons and representation from special constituencies."

Number eight was titled "Information and Referral": "Be it resolved, that a Federal funding incentive grant be given to libraries to serve as information and referral centers, along with the appropriate community and educational organizations, in supplying the necessary information requested by patrons.

"Be it further resolved, that an aggressive public awareness effort to promote the utilization of such centers, whether at the libraries or as separate centers, be established."

And, finally, number nine, "Resource Sharing": "Be it resolved, that through consultation and consensus with local units, the responsible State level agencies should initiate plans for interlibrary cooperation or expand current efforts. Through the same process, regional, multistate consultation and consensus should be initiated and existing interlibrary resource sharing expanded. Current voluntary initiatives in forming networks, interlibrary loan arrangements, and resources sharing consortia should be respected, encouraged, and promoted as examples of the value of grass roots ability to achieve success through voluntary efforts. Federal funds should be continued to assist in the development and maintenance of such interlibrary cooperative activities; and

"Be it further resolved, that every State library agency should take a leadership role in initiating planning sessions, drawing together the required statewide leadership, and monitoring and encouraging the development of these plans. Regional resource sharing plans should arise out of consultation among States in the region or, if in existence, should represent such consultation. The national resource sharing effort should be aimed at promoting growth through incentive grants and provision of technical advice and encouragement, such as that now furnished by the Network Advisory Committee of the Library of Congress."

MR. REGGIE: Thank you very much, Delia and Marcus. I want to make a couple of announcements and we are going to move the program right on, because everyone now has the Theme II resolutions. We have gotten some very good news. The disabled delegates and the deaf delegates will be meeting after this session to synthesize those two resolutions, and they will make their work product available to the Resolutions Committee. I think that is a good breakthrough.

(Applause.)

The resolutions, as a product of the synthesizing that will take place, will be at the message desk, hopefully, at seven o'clock in the morning so you can pick them up. It will give you a chance to look at them, and you might want to compare them to the copy that you have tonight in your hands. Understand, again, that maybe the turn of a phrase, or word, or sentence may not be exactly what you would have done; but please keep in mind that it is done in good faith.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I have a change which I think is an error. Under the Theme I, the resolution connected with the deaf says: "Establish a Library Committee of the Library Commission for the Deaf which will include deaf individuals." I believe, as it was passed earlier in our theme session, it should read: "Establish a Library Committee for the Deaf of the Library Commission which will include deaf individuals." It is important.

MR. REGGIE: You are correct. I was there, and inadvertently it was written that way. I appreciate you calling it to our attention. Will those from Theme I please make that correction?

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of information. It was said several times that we are going to synthesize the duplications. Does that mean that some of the other resolutions will be added after these are synthesized, because we will have many fewer than 34?

MR. REGGIE: No, we will not be working to add any more to the agenda. We will be using the synthesization only for the purpose of better understanding and to more adequately cover the same topic, but we won't use those slots for new material.

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time tomorrow morning, assuming that in fact the synthesized resolutions are available at seven o'clock, and assuming again that we will begin promptly at eight o'clock with our deliberations, I was wondering if those people who have amendments to the synthesized resolutions submit them in writing to the Chair before eight o'clock, could these amendments be read at the end of the reading of the resolution in order to facilitate the making of the amendments? Because I foresee a great problem with amendments in the morning.

MR. REGGIE: We will be happy to receive the amendments, but I think it's too much of an onus on the delegates to have to pre-file before the session starts.

MR. SULLIVAN: That was not my intention. That was simply to facilitate it.

MR. REGGIE: We will be glad to have them in hand to facilitate it.

A PARTICIPANT: We will be able to speak to an amendment?

MR. REGGIE: You will be able to speak to an amendment.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those of us who have petitions out circulating, would you announce where a full petition may be turned in by anyone who is circulating it.

MR. REGGIE: Yes, that's a very good question and I happen to have the answer. The petitions that you want to file on initiative to have a resolution considered should be filed after this meeting and before eight o'clock with Jean-Anne South at the Rules Desk in the registration area.

We are going to Theme II right now. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present to you those two representatives from Theme II who will discuss their resolutions. From the State of Massachusetts, Ms. Janet London, and from the State of Illinois, Mr. Howard Dillon.

MS. LONDON: Thank you. I just want to say first that the rank numbers are incorrect, and as I go through them, I will give the correct one as they came up; with the number of people voting for the particular resolution.

Lifelong learning was the total name of our theme, and this one was also the issue called "Lifelong Learning." It was ranked number five, not number one.

Again, I will not read the entire resolution, but I would like to make an addition that was left out when it was printed up. In the first sentence after "race, religion," you add comma—this is approximate, because we had to remember—"handicapped or other condition." We can look this up when we get back together tonight. And it reads: "Therefore be it resolved, libraries, together with these other agencies and institutions, should work cooperatively to provide the resources and services that will enable all our people to take advantage of opportunities available to them."

The second one is ranked second, and the issue was literacy: "The United States Department of Education should give high priority to the problem of adult functional illiteracy by expanding existing programs or planning new programs to provide for effective literacy programs at the community level. Such programs should specifically fund library and information agencies that are capable of implementing such programs."

The next is ranked number one, and Department of Education is the issue: "There should be created within the United States Department of Education an Office of Libraries and Information Services administered by an Assistant Secretary."

The next page rank was third, not fourth. The issue is funding existing Federal programs: "To provide Federal funding under existing enabling legislation for: 1) Elementary and Seconuary Education Act; 2) the Higher Education Act; 3) the Library Services and Construction Act, and provide direction for new legislation."

The rank of the issue access, that says fifth, I believe is fourth: "Resolved, that children must have access to library print and nonprint materials, library instruction, and library enrichment programs through every stage of their development and education."

238

MR. DILLON: The rank order from here on out is correct. Resource sharing is one: "There is an immediate need for the development of a system to improve the sharing of resources." Under means A, B, and C, you see such things as a national system, State and regional networks, support for research and development, and a network for a national periodical system.

On the next page, rank seven, a national library act: "Resolved, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services endorse and support the enactment of a national library act incorporating the general principles, goals, and objectives of S.1124, with modifications which include categorical funding to better provide for rural and sparsely populated areas, impacted areas, all types of libraries, and other modifications as shall appear desirable after full public hearings before the appropriate congressional committee."

The next page, ranked eighth, school libraries: "Be it resolved, that the Federal Government, under the direction of the United States Department of Education, mandate an adequate library (media center) staffed by certified (qualified) personnel for every elementary, middle, and secondary school, and provide further access to service for schools in sparsely populated areas.

"Be it further resolved, that library services for small schools be provided through cooperative arrangements contracted among school districts and/or through regional service centers to ensure certified teacher/librarians and adequate resources."

Rank nine, public relations: "A professional public information program should be launched nationwide, dedicated to informing the public about: 1) existing library and information services; 2) library and information services which are needed but unavailable; 3) the level of support needed to provide quality library and information services in the future."

Finally, rank ten, access, our second resolution on that topic. I want to give you a correction in line one. Please strike the parenthesis and the word "including." Following the word "institutions," you will insert four words, end paren, "including correctional and medical."

Now that line and the text reads: "All learners, regardless of age, residence institutions (including correctional and medical), race, disability, or ethnic or cultural background, should have continuing access to the information and materials necessary to cope with the increasing complexity of our changing social, economic, and technological environment."

MR. REGGIE: Thank you very, very much. My thanks to Ms. London and Mr. Dillon.

A PARTICIPANT: I'm just a little confused about what happened here. Some of the resolutions they read "Means." Some of the resolutions they read "Policy." I hope the Resolutions Committee will get them in the correct form.

MR. REGGIE: You are right, and you will notice some of them are not in resolution form. The Committee will work on that too.

A PARTICIPANT: The wording on our ninth resolution is for public information. Therefore, I wonder if we could change the name of the issue to "Public Information" from "Public Relations." It's an editorial slip that just got carried along.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. The committee will take that into consideration.

A PARTICIPANT: I would like to ensure that the following goes in the permanent record. I don't know whether others will care to join me or not. In order that future conferences may benefit from the inevitable mistakes, I would like to place in the permanent record the following observations.

I believe that discussion would have been greatly helped if the themes for the White House Conference had mirrored those of the various Governors' Conferences, rather than a rearrangement by the staff on different principles.

(Applause.)

I believe that the two-hour meals, which included the introduction of many dignitaries and speeches by persons of note, represented an inefficient use of delegates' time. Working luncheons would have been more helpful. I believe that much too much time was spent in largely ceremonial activities. I came prepared and anxious to work.

I believe that the staff's insensitivities to the needs and feelings of alternates was remarkable, constant, and reprehensible.

I believe that the staff should have adequately trained the clerical support for the theme working groups so that working papers were processed with dispatch, and an imaginative run-through with stated contingency plans might have helped.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. Posted in the registration area later will be information on the paper ballot. I have not been able to give you a straight answer on that paper ballot business tomorrow. In the registration area later this evening there will be the ground rules on that and you will be able to get those.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me just say a personal word before we adjourn tonight. I want to thank you all for your splendid cooperation. You could have gotten huffy with me. You could have gotten short-tempered because of the heat. I thank you very, very much for your indulgence. There were times, I'm sure, I should have recognized you quicker and I didn't and I flubbed, and we took a long time to get the material out. But it is because of your patience you make presiding here as moderator a real joy, and I want to thank you for making my job easy. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. DOLAN: Mr. Chairman, Louise Blalock Dolan, Rhode Island. As we are aware that the resolutions we approve will represent the work of this Conference across the Nation, I move that this body formally urge the Resolutions Committee to pay strict attention to the concepts of clarity and brevity as they work at it and refine the resolutions to eliminate redundancy in the priority resolutions.

MR. REGGIE: And I say to that, Amen, Sister, Amen.

Thanks very much.

(Whereupon, at 4:55 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

Participants

Panel:
Edmund Reggie
Moderator

Simon Newman
Parliamentarian

John Stackpole
Parlimentarian

Speaker:
Daniel J. Boorstin
Library of Congress

Members of the Resolutions Committee

William Pearson

Delia Martinez

Janet London

Howard Dillon

Robert Braude

Nancy Lorenzi

Duane Johnson

Robert Navarro

Marcus Salazar

Adoption of Resolutions

Monday, November 19, 1979

MR. REGGIE: Ladies and gentlemen, our program is going to start now, so we will call this general session to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, at this time I have the high pleasure and distinct honor of presenting to you Mr. Charles Benton.

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Thank you very much.

I can think of no more fitting speaker to address this Conference as we prepare to enter our final deliberations than the distinguished Librarian of Congress, Daniel J. Boorstin.

We who are members of NCLIS are fortunate indeed that this universal man is a member of our group. Dr. Boorstin is an author, educator, historian, and barrister-at-large of world renown. His distinguished academic career began at Harvard University, where he graduated summa cum laude, and continued at Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes scholar, and on through the Inner Temple in London and Yale and Cambridge Universities. He has taught at many of America's leading universities and around the world and holds numerous literary and academic honors, including the 1974 Pulitzer Prize for his work, *The Americans—The Democratic Experience*.

I will close my introduction with his own words from his Pulitzer Prize-winning book, which I believe are particularly appropriate on this final day of this landmark White House Conference: "History wrote, it has been man's effort to accommodate himself to what he could not do. American history in the Twentieth Century more than ever before tests man's ability to accommodate himself to all the new things he could do."

Ladies and gentlemen, the Librarian of Congress, Dr. Daniel Boorstin.

(Applause.)

Remarks of Dr. Boorstin

DR. BOORSTIN: Members of the White House Conference, I welcome this opportunity to talk to all of you folks, people attending the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

As the Librarian of Congress I speak for a national fortress of knowledge. In other words, I speak for a library and for libraries. Our relentless Jeffersonian quest tempts us to believe that all technologies, and perhaps, too, all ideas, were created equal. This favorite axiom is only slightly clouded by another axiom equally American, for we have touched a touching national belief in annual models. In our national lexicon "newer" is a synonym for "better."

The result is illustrated in the title, and I suspect too in the preoccupations, of this Conference. Libraries, or, as you say, library services, are here equated with information services, which is perilously close to saying that knowledge can or should be equated with information.

In the few minutes allotted to me this morning I would like to focus your attention on the distinction between knowledge and information, the importance of the distinction, and the dangers of failing to recognize it.

You have a hint of my theme in the melodramatic difference today between the condition of our knowledge institutions and our information institutions. The last two decades have seen the spectacular growth of the information industry. We are exhilarated by this example of American ingenuity and enterprise, the frontier spirit in the late Twentieth Century.

A magic computer technology now accomplishes the dreariest task in seconds, surpasses the accuracy of the human brain, controls production lines and refineries, arranges inventories, and retrieves records. All this makes us proud of the human imagination. And all this, I am glad to say, has produced a new, unpredicted world of profit and employment.

The information industry, we are happy to note, is flourishing. It is a growth industry. It enjoys the accelerating momentum of technology and the full vitality of the marketplace. The information industries are a whole new world of business celebrity. The jargon of the stock exchange accurately describes theirs as "glamorous" stocks.

Their leaders hold the national spotlight, and with good reason. The President of the United States even appointed the head of one of the greatest of these companies to be perhaps our most importnat ambassador, to the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, what has become of our knowledge institutions? These do not deal in the storage and retrieval of information, nor in the instant flow of facts and figures which will be displaced by tomorrow's reports or bulletins. Rather, they deal in the enduring treasure of the whole human past. They include our colleges and our universities and, of course, our libraries. While the information industry flourishes and seeks new avenues of growth, while people compete for a chance to buy into them, our knowledge institutions go begging.

Knowledge institutions do not pay the kind of dividends that are reflected on the stock market. They are sometimes called philanthropic, which means that they profit nobody, except everybody, and that their dividends go to the whole community. These knowledge institutions, and especially our public libraries, ask charity, the community's small change, just to keep their heat and their lights on and to keep their unrenovated doors open. We, the knowledge institutions, are the Nation's poor relations. We anxiously solicit and gratefully acknowledge the crumbs.

It is especially appropriate in this White House Conference that we should focus on the distinction between knowledge and information. Today I would like to put it very briefly into historical perspective.

In my own lifetime we have moved from the age of publishing into an age of broadcasting. In that age of publishing, launched by Gutenberg, printed materials with a community's memory, wisdom, literary imagination, and knowledge were, or course, widely diffused. The vehicle was the book. Knowledge was thought to be cumulative. New books did not displace old books. When today's books arrived, people did not throw away yesterday's as if they were newspapers or out of date bulletins of information.

On the contrary, the years gave a new vitality to the books of past centuries. We too easily forgot then that the printed book, too, was a triumph of technology. The dead could now speak not only to the select few who could afford a manuscript book, but to thousands in homes, in schools, and in libraries everywhere. The very words of Homer and Plato and Machiavelli and Dickens now could reach everyone.

Books became the vehicles and the record—also the catalyst and the incentive—for most of the knowledge, the amusement, and the sacred visions of the whole human race. The printed book has given all humanity its inexpensive, speedy, reliable vehicles across the centuries. Books conquer time.

But the peculiar magical vehicles of our age conquer space. Television makes us instant eyewitnesses of riots in Iran, airplane wrecks in India, children starving in Cambodia, guerilla attacks in Rhodesia—along, of course, with an overflowing current of entertainment programs—and the special commodity of our electronic age of broadcasting is, of course, information, in all its amplitude, in all its formats.

While knowledge is orderly and cumulative, information is random and miscellaneous. We are flooded by instant messages from everywhere in excruciating profusion. In our ironic Twentieth Century version of Gresham's law, information tends to drive knowledge out of circulation. The oldest, the most established, the cumulative is displaced by the most recent, the most problematic. The latest information about anything and everything is collected, diffused, received, stored, and retrieved before anyone can or could discover whether the facts have meaning. The mountain climbing symdrome rules us. Information is gathered simply because it's there. The electronic devices for diffusion, storage, and retrieval are used simply because they, too, are there, and otherwise the investment might be wasted.

I'm not complaining. On the contrary, I am charmed and amazed, for so much of human progress has come from people playing enthusiastically with their new technological toys, with results that are astonishing and often productive.

Whatever the motive, we see the knowledge industry being transformed and even, to some extent, displaced by an information industry. In the school room, history tends to be displaced by current events. The resources of science, and even of the humanities, are newly dominated by multiplying journals, by looseleaf services, by preprints and information stored in computers, quickly and conveniently modified, and instantly retrievable.

To the ancient question; "what is truth?" we Americans now reply, "Sorry, I haven't yet seen the seven o'clock news."

What does all this mean for the world of knowledge, which is, of course, the world of libraries? It should be plainer than ever that our libraries are needed to keep civilization in perspective. The more electronic our society becomes, the more urgent it is that we have prosperous knowledge institutions. Yet, this urgency is less noted every year. If you consult the authoritative Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, the 1933 edition, and look under "Libraries," you will be pleased to find that there is an article on libraries—on public libraries—an extensive article, but if you consult its successor published in 1968 and looked for an answer for libraries, you will find no article at all. Instead, you will find a cross-reference which says, "See under Information Storage and Retrieval."

The fashionable chronologic myopia of our time tempts enthusiasts to forget the main and proper mission of our libraries. "Libraries have been selling the wrong product for years," one such faddist exclaims. "They have been emphasizing reading. The product that we have is information." People who speak thus are false Messiahs.

Of course, we must use computer technology and enlist the whole information industry. At the Library of Congress we have tried to be a leader, and I think have to some extent succeeded in being a leader in these uses and exploring their applications. We will continue to do so.

In the long run, however, we will not serve the information industry, nor our civilization, if we encourage extravagant or misplaced expectations for the role of information or the devices which serve it up. We must never forget that our libraries are our fortresses of knowledge. If we allow these rich and redolent resources, still preserved mainly in books, to be displaced by the latest thing, by today's news, and journals, and preprints, and looseleaf services, and telephone conversations, and currently revised printouts, we will isolate the world of scholarship from the world of libraries.

To avoid such dangers as these, we have set up in the Library of Congress a Center for the Book, to use old and find new ways to keep the book flourishing, to keep people reading books, and to enlist other media to promote reading.

One such project, "Read More About It," with the enthusiastic collaboration of the Columbia Broadcasting System, was shown on television the other night after the showing of the movie *All Quiet on the Western Front,* and it brought our suggested reading list to some 31 million viewers. We must and will do more of this.

If librarians cease to become scholars in order to become computer experts, scholars will cease to feel at home in our libraries; and then our whole citizenry will find that our libraries add little to their view of the world, but only reinforce the pressures of the "imperial instant everywhere." To enlist scholars more actively and more intimately in the scholarly activities of the Library of Congress, we are now setting up in the Library a council of scholars. They will help us discover the needs of the scholarly world and will help us provide an ongoing inventory of the state of knowledge and of ignorance.

A great civilization needs many and varied resources. In our time, our libraries have two paradoxical and sometimes conflicting roles, and it is well that we should recognize when and how they conflict. Of course, we must be repositories of information, but we must also somehow remain places of refuge from the tidal waves of information and misinformation. Our libraries must be conspicuously the treasuries of news that stays news.

The Era of the Enlightenment, the late Eighteenth Century, the age of Franklin and Jefferson, the founding epic of our Nation, was an age of publishing. That age left us a happy phrase. They said that people should read for amusement and instruction. This was why they read the poetry of Dryden and Pope, the philosophy of Hume, the history of Gibbon, the novels of Sterne and Fieldings. The two delights, amusement and instruction, were inseparable. The book was a prototypical provider of both. When a person was amused, it was a quite autonomous activity set off by a catalyst which was the book. In those days, book publishing was an amusement industry. But our age of broadcasting tends to displace amusement with entertainment. While we once had to amuse ourselves, we now expect to be entertained. The program is the entertainment. While the amusement is in us, others must and can be our entertainers.

Now, of course, there is a flourishing entertainment industry. We do not consider book publishing to be part of it. This is something to reflect on. It is a clue, also, to the special need for libraries. The more an industry tries to entertain us, the more we need libraries, where pleasure and amusement are found by the free and active spirit.

It is a cliche of our time that what this Nation needs is an informed citizenry, by which we mean a citizenry that is up on the latest information—which has not failed to read this week's news magazine, today's newspapers, or to watch the seven o'clock news, and perhaps also the news at ten o'clock—always for more information, always to be better informed. I wonder if that is what we need. I suggest, rather, that what we need, what any free country needs, is a knowledgeable citizenry. Information, like entertainment, is something that someone else provides us. It is, properly speaking, a service. We expect to be entertained and also to be informed, but we cannot be "knowledged." Each of us must acquire knowledge for himself. Knowledge comes from the free mind foraging in the rich pastures of the whole "everywhere" past. It comes from finding order and meaning in the whole human experience. The autonomous reader amusing and knowledging himself is the be all and the end all of our libraries.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN BENTON: Thank you very, very much for those most appropriate comments. No person in our country has enunciated more clearly the interrelated roles of knowledge and the media in our society than Dr. Boorstin. Over to your moderator now.

Proceedings

MR. REGGIE: Thank you very much. Now we are ready to get to some business that we promised you we would be getting to on time.

I think it might be appropriate that we just establish for everybody's understanding what ground rules we are expecting to follow. We will, first, bring up the resolutions as they have been synthesized. In some instances I'm not quite certain if they have or if they have not, but the presenters will go over that with you. As you ruled yesterday by your motion, they will read only the "Resolved" clauses or paragraphs.

We will take up the petitions, that is resolutions offered by initiative or by petition. In that regard, we would like to state that we will deal with the petitions under the provision of section 4.7.1 of the rules. We will take them up in the order in which they have been filed. That is, in the chronological order in which you have them in your stack by number.

We will read the "Resolved" clauses of those resolutions that are offered by petition. When that is read, we are going to ask you if you want to consider that resolution. To merely consider it requires a two-thirds vote of the delegates. If you vote two-thirds that you want to consider it, then we will enter the debate and, ultimately, vote on that resolution offered by initiative or petition. To pass that resolution will require a simple majority.

In that discussion on that resolution we are going to curtail debate. We are going to permit comments, such as, "It's poor form," or "This resolution is just like another resolution that we passed," or something of that type. We will permit it, but not discussion on the merits of the resolution, not at that juncture. Then we will vote two-thirds for consideration. We will then have the debate on the motion, which will be open to regular debate, and then the adoption on a majority vote.

Last night our Resolutions Committee worked until past midnight trying to synthesize those resolutions that we had. You have them in your possession. It is my understanding that any blind persons here have readers. If that is not correct, if you will please make it known to me, a reader will immediately be supplied, because we will be passing up the "Whereas" clauses or the preamble clauses and we want to make sure that there is a full disclosure for everyone.

We are ready to start now. With your permission we will move on to the first resolution marked number one, and Mr. Wink Pearson of the State of Vermont will present that resolution.

MR. PEARSON: This is resolution number one, entitled "The First Amendment and Public Issues": "Therefore be it resolved, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services affirms its support for the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which guarantees freedom of inquiry, freedom to read, freedom to publish, and free and full access to information, especially information about public processes, and that these freedoms are essential to the maintenance of free libraries and informational services; and

"Be it further resolved, that public libraries should promote and make available information services on public issues for all segments of the community by acquisition of materials that would present various sides of controversial issues, by supporting discussions and forums on issues, by publicizing widely that these opportunities for community discussions are available, and by educating public officials on the availability and use of information resources; and

"Be it further resolved, that Federal funding of incentive grants be made available to libraries to serve as information and referral centers in cooperation with other community and educational organizations; and

"Be it further resolved, that an aggressive public awareness effort be established to promote the utilization of libraries as information and referral centers."

MR. REGGIE: Delegates, the reading will constitute the moving in every instance, and so no seconding will be required.

I want to remind you that the microphones will be open to your comments, discussions, amendments, etc., but I want to point out to you what we said yesterday. Maybe the phrase isn't precisely what you want, or the word you could think of would be much better, or the sentence would be much better, but give us your indulgence on that. We will try our very best to shape it up if there is a grammatical error. We are going to ask you for a curative resolution at the end, asking staff if there is such error that they be allowed, without changing of the substance of it, to clear the resolution.

With that in mind, the Chair recognizes the gentleman at microphone two.

MR. GAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, Robert Gaylor, delegate from Michigan. I would like to make just one small word amendment. It's the second "Resolved," which begins, "And therefore be it further resolved, that public libraries . . . " I would like to delete the word "public." As an academic librarian, I feel that it should not just say "public libraries," because academic libraries do this, and schools as well.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to the deletion of the word "public"? If there is no objection, we won't have to vote because we will have unanimous consent to change it. So, I will ask you again, is there objection to the deletion of the word "public"? If you have objection, raise your hand, please.

(A showing of hands.)

Okay, there is objection.

A PARTICIPANT: It should say not "public" but "public funded."

MR. REGGIE: That would change the substance of the motion, and, therefore, I rule you out of order.

Are you ready to vote? As many of you as are in favor of the motion to amend the second "Resolved" clause by removing the word "public" from the first line, signify by voting yes.

MR. PIERARD: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak to the amendment.

MR. REGGIE: Oh, I'm sorry, sir.

MR. PIERARD: Richard Pierard, lay delegate from Indiana. The idea behind public libraries was that this was to be part of citizenship education and citizenship literacy. I'm not sure that the intent of it was to put the academic librarians in the same role. In other words, it was to engage the public librarians more in community education and making local citizens aware of local issues. That is the reason why "public libraries" was put in the original motion.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you sir. Does anybody else want to be heard on the motion?

MS. EDMONSON: Susan Edmonson, Kentucky. I agree that not only public libraries should have this responsibility. However, I would agree with the lady who said that "publicly funded" would be a more appropriate phrase, because if we simply delete "public libraries," this means that we are resolving that such libraries as medical libraries should have this necessary function of promoting information on community and civic things, and I don't believe that is the intent of the resolution at all.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you very much. Are you ready to vote regarding the motion to delete the word "public" in the first line of the second resolved paragraph? If you vote A, that's yes; if you vote B, that's no; if you vote C, you have abstained from voting.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

Has everybody voted? There are 254 yes votes; 182 no votes; and 11 abstentions. The amendment passes.

MR. BURNS: Mr. Chairman, Bill Burns, delegate from the State of Iowa. With no intent to belabor the discussion, I do have an amendment that I personally feel is important. To add to the first resolved after the word "affirms," "in the strongest language possible," and after the word "for the," "the primacy and indivisibility of the first amendment." I also think it's important that possibly this first resolved be separated from the second, because I think it dilutes the intent.

MR. REGGIE: Are you making a motion for two amendments? I only have one. After the word "affirms" insertion of the words "in the strongest language possible for the primacy and indivisibility of the First Amendment."

MR. BURNS: That's it, sir.

MR. REGGIE: You have heard it. Is there any discussion on this amendment.

A PARTICIPANT: I didn't hear a second.

MR. REGGIE: Yes, it has been moved and seconded. The question has been asked for. Is there any objection to voting?

There being no objection, are you ready to vote? As many of you are as in favor of the amendment to insert after the word "affirm," "in the strongest language possible for the primacy and indivisibility of the First Amendment," signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The Chair will rule that the nos have it and that the amendment has failed.

MR. CASTO: James Casto, West Virginia. I speak to the penultimate paragraph of the resolution and I would move to delete it. As a newspaper man, I am indeed delighted to see this group coming to the defense of the belief of the first amendment. But I find it indeed ironic that the support of the first amendment is voiced in a resolution which, I think, contains the at least implied threat to it, posed by Federal funding of these information and referral centers. Mr. Keppel warned us earlier in this Conference that censorship can be both intentional and unintentional, and I think the latter is often worse than the former. I would respectfully request that the group at least consider this threat.

I move to delete the paragraph in question.

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: It has been moved and seconded that we delete the second to last paragraph in its entirety. Does anybody want to speak to that?

MS. JACOBSON: Nancy Jacobson, delegate from Massachusetts. This is one of the most important "Resolveds" in the whole resolution, I feel, and it has nothing to do with censorship. It just provides information and referral for all people through libraries.

MR. REGGIE: Anybody else want to be heard?

(No response.)

Are you ready to vote? If there is no objection to voting, all those in favor of the amendment to delete the paragraph in its entirety, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The motion fails.

MS. CAPLAN: I would like to offer an amendment to this resolution. I'm Marsha Caplan from Ohio.

On page one, it will have two "Whereases" to be inserted as the second and third "Whereas," and it will have one "Resolved" to be inserted as the second "Resolved": "Whereas, public libraries can expose people to the wealth of creative writing available; and

"Whereas, an individual has the right to read what he or she wishes,

"Be it resolved, that public libraries make available a variety of traditional and contemporary creative writing, including the works of small and independent publishers which are often outside the visible bibliographic network, and that these works of creative writing be easily accessible to all regardless of age."

We feel that this resolution covers only public issues and informational nonfiction works and that a whole area of library service has been left out that's very important and still is being censored in many communities.

MR. REGGIE: The Chair is going to rule that the motion to make the amendment changes the character of the resolution as presented, and is therefore out of order.

(Applause.)

Are you ready to vote on the resolution?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: As many of you are as in favor of the adoption of the resolution as amended, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorous of nays.)

The ayes have it. We will move to number two, which will also be presented by Mr. Wink Pearson of Vermont.

MR. PEARSON: The second resolution is entitled "National Information Policy": "Therefore be it resolved, that a national information policy be studied and implemented. This policy should: 1) guarantee all citizens equal and full access to publicly funded library and information services; 2) ensure government agencies at all levels work together to make available all new and existing library and information services to the maximum extent possible; 3) protect the privacy of all segments of our society, including personal privacy, economic privacy, and national security."

MR. CHITLIK: Mr. Chairman, Paul Chitlik, State of California. I would like to make an additive amendment: "Resolved, that this policy should reaffirm the tradition of local control over the selection and purchase of library materials."

This is a point that has been left out of any other resolution, and it fits perfectly here as part of the national policy to maintain the individuality of community libraries and ensure the responsiveness of community libraries to the needs of their community.

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: Does anybody want to be heard on the amendment?

(No response.)

Are you ready to vote on the amendment?

A PARTICIPANT: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I really would like to have the machines checked. I think that's only fair.

MR. REGGIE: We are going to do that right now. Your point is well taken. Just for a test, would everybody open your machines and vote A?

(So doing.)

We are showing 488 votes: two of them on B, and one of them on C. I understand from the parliamentarian that the machine is not as critical as we would want it to be. That is, it may be a few numbers off; but there is that possibility in the totalization that it could be slightly off. So I do want to make you aware that we are told about that.

Are you ready to vote? The amendment is for a fourth paragraph to be added: "Be it further resolved, that we reaffirm the tradition of local control over the selection and acquisition of library materials." As many of you are as in favor of the motion, please vote A; those opposed, vote B; and if you abstain, vote C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

318, yes; 182, no; and 10 abstentions. The motion passes, and we recognize the lady at number one.

MS. IVORY: I'm Ming Ivory from Massachusetts. It seems to me in this resolution as it was presented yesterday, there was an additional paragraph that referred to the Federal Government redressing imbalances that existed in access. Could someone explain where that paragraph ended up?

MR. REGGIE: I wouldn't have the slightest idea. I know that they got together and worked until after midnight last night piecing it together. It may be found in another paragraph, in another resolution. I'm just not able or qualified to tell you where it is.

MS. SWANKER: Mr. Chairman, Esther Swanker, delegate from New York. I offer an amendment to the first "Resolved," that it shall read: "guarantee all citizens free, equal, and full access to publicly funded library and information services." Insert the word "free" in front of "equal."

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: It has been seconded. Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

Without objection then, we will vote. Everybody that is in favor of inserting the word "free," signify by voting A; those opposed, B; and those abstaining, C.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, this point is too important, this issue is too critical to this Conference to trust a machine that seems to be improperly working. Could we request a standing vote?

MR. REGGIE: Yes. All those in favor of inserting the word "free" please stand. I will ask the staff in each section to do the counting. There are handicapped people who cannot stand. Those people will raise their hands. Would the counters please come up to the rostrum and make a report on the yes votes?

Those opposed, please stand.

Now I need the tallies from the tellers. The amendment failed 210 to 197.

MR. SPRAUVE: Mr. Chairman, Gilbert Sprauve from the Virgin Islands. I am going to suggest that the amendment I would like to make will shorten it and also improve on it. I think that the very last line and the line before that—"including personal privacy, economic privacy, and national security" ought to be deleted. I think it weakens the rest of that statement and weakens the whole resolution. My amendment would be for deleting the words starting with "including" and ending with "security."

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: It has been moved and seconded. Are you ready to vote? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it. The motion fails.

MS. EASTMAN: Mr. Chairman, Ann Eastman, citizen delegate from Virginia. Perhaps the gentleman's problem is that national security is not a privacy. I would like to recommend that the Resolutions Committee make an editorial change in resolution two so it makes sense. That's our problem.

A PARTICIPANT: I call for the question, Mr. Chairman.

(Applause.)

MR. REGGIE: The question has been called for. All in favor of taking up the question signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it. We're ready to vote. As many of you are as in favor of the resolution as presented signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it. Let's go to number three.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, there is one resolution in the packet that does have a critical time factor, Resolution 13. There has to be someone upstairs at 11 o'clock to testify at the congressional hearing. I move that we go to that one, so this body can express to the Congress what we want to do.

MR. REGGIE: To suspend the rule, sir, takes two-thirds. You heard the motion. Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of going out of turn and taking resolution 13, and suspending the rules so we may do so, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of Ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The Chair rules that we will go to 13. We are going to ask Ms. Delia Martinez to please give us that one.

MS. MARTINEZ: "Therefore be it resolved, that an Office of Library and Information Services be established within the United States Department of Education directed by an Assistant Secretary of Education; and

"Be it further resolved, that this Secretary shall administer all grants and programs currently administered by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, and shall establish communications with all Federal programs related to library and information services; and

"Be it further resolved, that a representative from the White House Conference on Library and Information Services testify on this resolution before the Congressional hearing on Monday, November 19, 1979."

MR. REGGIE: All right, are you ready to vote?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: As many of you are as in favor of the resolution number 13, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed?

(Chorus of nays.)

You're wonderful. The resolution passes. Okay, we will go back to our regular order. Number three will be presented by Ms. Janet London of Massachusetts.

MS. LONDON: "Therefore be it resolved, that the United States Department of Education implement or expand literacy programs at the community level; and

"Be it further resolved, that such programs should specifically fund library and information agencies that are capable of implementing these programs, and that States shall: 1) identify the functionally illiterate adult and out-of-school youth population; 2) identify effective education and library adult literacy programs; 3) identify localities not now offering adult literacy programs; 4) coordinate relevant existing education and library programs; 5) plan and implement adult literacy and out of school youth programs in communities where they do not exist—these programs to include materials and/or space for tutorial programs in libraries; and

"Be it further resolved, that under the United States Department of Education, States shall encourage a cooperative effort among public educational agencies, libraries, and private nonprofit organizations with functionally illiterate adults and out-of-school youth participating in the planning process, and that the funding for such programs shall be the responsibility of State and Federal governments."

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the resolution. Does anyone want to speak to it?

MS. JACKSON: I am Ruth Jackson from the Virginia delegation. I would like to propose another "Resolved" as an amendment. One of the problems that we have with adult literacy programs is that there are not sufficient high-interest low-level reading materials to promote the program.

My amendment is to add: "Be it also resolved, that the Federal Government should provide tax incentive or contract awards to publishers who would agree to publish titles of high-interest low-reading-level books and media resources for new adult literates."

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of the amendment, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The amendment is defeated.

A PARTICIPANT: The question.

MR. REGGIE: The question has been moved.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of taking up the question, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The question will be voted. We are now voting on the literacy resolution number three. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, a point of information. We have just passed resolution number 13. I would ask the Chair to inform us who will testify according to that resolution. The very last paragraph calls for a respresentative from this Conference to testify.

MR. REGGIE: The Chair feels that he does not have the authority to make that appointment. However, if anyone has a suggestion, the Chair would entertain it.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, if the body were willing, I would recommend that Delia Martinez, who introduced this resolution, be asked to go to the hearing and to read the motion which was passed in order to place this before the Congressional Committee.

(Applause.)

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of Delia Martinez, who gave you the presentation, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed, say no.

(No response.)

You won them over.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge that we have another designee to testify. We have former Congressman Carl Elliott, who has been a great leader in libraries. I would ask to have him join Ms. Martinez.

A PARTICIPANT: Here, here.

MR. REGGIE: It has been moved and seconded that we have Congressman Elliott join Ms. Martinez in that testimony. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The ayes have it. So both of them will represent us.

Now to resolution four, please.

MS. LONDON: "Therefore be it resolved, that barriers to such services, whether legal, fiscal, technical, attitudinal, environmental, cultural, or other barriers, must be eliminated and physical facilities and staff must be capable of providing services to all segments of society; and

"Be it further resolved, that Federal legislation be enacted to guarantee the right of equal access to all publicly held information for all citizens; and

"Be it further resolved, that institutions educating library and information services practitioners assume responsibility to address the needs of said consumers through their training and education, and that guidelines by appropriate governmental leaders establish standards of in-service training, and that training standards for library professionals be implemented without delay; and

"Be it further resolved, that a national public policy to promote universal library and information services be adopted; and

"Be it further resolved, that access restrictions be removed from library materials purchased with Federal funds; and

"Be it further resolved, that all learners, regardless of age, residence (including institutions), race, disability, or ethnic or cultural background, should have continuing access to the information and material necessary to cope with the increasing complexity of our changing social, economic, and technological environment; and

"Be it further resolved, that assistance be provided to establish and/or sustain libraries and other information centers in the United States and all States that wish to provide service at centers for independent learning bringing such services to those not now served, all with the cooperation of agencies, libraries and centers; and

"Be it further resolved, that such access programs be funded adequately by Federal, State, and local agencies, with public participation, under guidelines established by appropriate governmental legislation."

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I would like to offer, to add a clause to this resolution to read as follows: "Be it further resolved, that library service be extended to persons in correctional institutions and to persons in institutions for the mentally disabled."

MR. REGGIE: We will vote on the amendment. As many of you as are in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it.

A PARTICIPANT: It's already in here.

MR. REGGIE: The Chair will rule that Mr. Sullivan's motion passed. At the end of this session we are going to ask for authority for the Resolutions Committee to clean up those resolutions, and if it was in there and we said it again and it's redundant, they will clean it out or put it in its proper form. So there won't be any harm done, okay?

(Applause.)

Are you ready to vote on the motion?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REGGIE: Yes, ma'am.

THE PARTICIPANT: One point of information that involves this motion and all others. If the information is given in the "Whereases," does that information control what goes on?

MR. REGGIE: No, ma'am.

THE PARTICIPANT: So it does have to go into the "Resolved" as well?

MR. REGGIE: Right.

MS. SIMMONS: Ruby Simmons, Virgin Islands. I have an amendment to make on the first "Resolved." I would like it to include geographical barriers, because geographical barriers affect the Virgin Islands and all the other Territories.

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the motion. We will take it as a friendly amendment. Is there any objection to the adoption of it as a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: There being no objection, it's ordered. Is there any objection to voting?

A PARTICIPANT: I need a point of clarification. I'm a non-library-related delegate, as many of us are here, and sometimes we get a little confused by the jargon. Before I vote on this with an informed vote, I need some information. First of all, about the term "information." Does this include fiction and other forms of creative writing?

MR. REGGIE: Those people I hear out there are saying yes.

THE PARTICIPANT: Okay. And the other thing that I don't understand is the sixth "Whereas": "Whereas Federal regulations frequently restrict the right of access to library materials purchased with Federal funds," and then it has a corollary "Resolved" on the next page. I don't understand what that means, and I'd like some explanation.

MR. REGGIE: I believe that there are certain guidelines in the purchasing policies that do not allow free and open purchasing, which they want to eliminate. Are you ready now for the question?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

A PARTICIPANT: Call for the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REGGIE: As many of you as are in favor of the question, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed?

(No response.)

All in favor of the resolution as amended, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The "Access" resolution has been passed. We now move to number five, "Special Constituencies," which will be presented by Mr. Howard Dillon of the University of Chicago Library.

MR. DILLON: I want to point out that this is a three-page resolution, and the "Resolveds" are quite long. I want you to know that it was prepared initially by a caucus of the concerned persons from these special constituencies. They have worked carefully on it. The Resolutions Committee received their materials and reviewed them carefully.

I want to ask if this body would be willing for me to read the major points but not to read the entire text? I think perhaps the Chair should be advised, particularly by those who may not be able to read, because if they have objections, of course I would want to read it all.

MR. REGGIE: I think under the circumstances, Mr. Dillon's suggestion is well taken. This resolution, as you see it, was written by the disabled people and by the blind people in a meeting that they held jointly last night, and this is their work product.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: All right, are you ready to vote?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

A PARTICIPANT: What are we voting on?

MR. REGGIE: On the adoption of the resolution.

A PARTICIPANT: (through an interpreter): This list is missing the "Preamble." I want you to add the "Preamble" before Section A. We deleted the "Preamble" so that this could be consistent with all of the other "Whereases" and "Therefores." None of the other ones had a preamble, and we tried to incorporate what was in our "Preamble" in the "Whereas."

MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I think it's very important that that "Preamble" be included, because of the fact that you combined two separate resolutions.

MR. REGGIE: The Chair will rule that the "Preamble" will be restored for background source material. Unless there is objection, it will be so ordered. Is that all right with everybody?

(Applause.)

Now, all in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Okay, then the motion passes. Let's go to the next one. Resolution number six, "Lifelong Learning," will be given by Ms. Nancy Lorenzi.

MS. LORENZI: "Therefore be it resolved, that libraries together with those other agencies and institutions should work cooperatively to provide the resources and services that will enable all people to take advantage of opportunities available to them; and

"Be it further resolved, that programs be developed that create a climate for cultural, educational, and practical use in response to community needs."

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the resolution. Is there an amendment?

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I call for the question.

MR. REGGIE: The question has been moved.

A PARTICIPANT: I would like to say that I think this resolution is very general. Everything in it has been covered somewhere else. It really doesn't say anything. I strongly suggest we reject it, because I think it weakens us to put in something this general. Thank you.

MS. ELAM: Mr. Chairman, I was at the microphone.

MR. REGGIE: That's why I'm permitting you to go on. I won't permit anybody after you because the question has been called. Go ahead.

MS. ELAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this resolution which might make it specific. My name is Barbara Clark Elam and I'm a librarian delegate from the State of Massachussetts. I would like to add: "Be it further resolved, that individuals seeking and using these programs be involved in the planning and implementation in determining the needs of their communities."

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: You've heard it. It has been moved and seconded. Are you ready to vote on the amendment? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it. The amendment fails. Are you ready now to vote on the main motion?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Would you use your machines? If you want the resolution to pass as you have it in your hands, please click on to A. If you do not want it to pass, please click on to B. And if you want to abstain, please click to C and hold it there.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

204 for; 244 against; eight abstentions. The resolution fails. We will go now to number seven, which will be presented by Mr. Robert Braude, concerning networking.

MR. BRAUDE: This is resolution number seven, "Networking": "Therefore be it resolved, that a comprehensive approach be taken to the planning and development of multi-type library and information networks and programs, including both profit and not-for-profit libraries from the public and private sector; and

"Be it further resolved, that plans be developed at the national, regional, and local level to include specific plans for a national periodicals system and include the concept of a national lending library for print and non-print materials; and

"Be it further resolved, that plans be developed for the coordination of such library and information networks and programs which would identify the responsibility for such coordination in the United States Department of Education's Office of Library and Learning Resources (or its successor) and the State library agencies, and such other agencies, organizations, or libraries as are involved in such networks; and

"Be it further resolved, that control of such networks remain at the State or regional level; and

"Be it further resolved, that mechanisms be developed to ensure access by all individuals to such networks and programs; and

"Be it further resolved, that Federal and State funds be made available to continue to support and interconnect existing networks, as well as develop new networks, and that such funds should be designated for network operations and for grants in support of local cooperative action; and

"Be it further resolved, that all agencies and institutions that provide education and continuing education for library practitioners should offer training in the skills, knowledge, and abilities which will help ensure that practitioners are competent to provide access through these networks in a most effective manner."

MR. REGGIE: It has been moved for adoption. The gentleman at microphone one.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, to save time, I propose an amendment that would eliminate resolution number nine and make resolution number seven shorter. I am eliminating the third and fourth paragraph from seven and substitute "Therefore be it resolved, that control remain at the State or regional level, with a representative body at the national level appointed by the President or Congress being responsible for coordination and integration of regional and national systems."

What this resolution does, Mr. Chairman, is to give the power to the Department of Education; number nine gives the same power to the Library of Congress. Let our Congressmen decide which Federal agency in cooperation will do it.

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote on that amendment? Please go to abstain. Those of you in favor of the amendment, please click to A; those opposed, click to B; and those abstaining, click to C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

142, yea; 203, nay; and 118 abstaining. The amendment fails. Are you ready to vote on the resolution?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: There being no objection to voting, we will now call for the vote on the resolution as presented. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it, and it passes. We will now go to resolution number eight, and that will be presented by Mr. Howard Dillon, "Coordination of School and Public Service."

MR. DILLON: Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of this material in the Resolution Committee's packet, there was an error, and I will now correct that. The members of this body may want to also refer to Theme Packet II, which was distributed yesterday; I will be reading one paragraph from that as an insertion. It is rank number eight from Theme Packet II, which was titled "School Libraries." I will be reading from the second major paragraph under the heading "Specific Elements and Resources" and recasting that as a "Resolved." That material will be inserted on eight as the next to the last paragraph. It will be inserted just before what is now the last paragraph.

I am now reading from page eight of the Resolutions Committee and I will tell you when I am making the insertion: "Therefore be it resolved, that school and public library boards and administrators should establish policies for cooperation; and

"Be it further resolved, that school library and public library staff should specify procedures and implement programs for cooperation in accord with community and school needs."

I am now moving to the insertion which I take from the packet for Theme Group II, rank eight: "Be it further resolved, that Congress enact a law mandating each State to set guidelines for the establishment of a school library in each school and that States implement Federal guidelines and set standards for libraries in all schools and evaluate local efforts, and that local school districts plan and implement an appropriate program for their community which fits within the Federal and State guidelines."

Now returning to page eight of the original packet: "Be it further resolved, that the Federal Government be urged to fund at full authorized levels those legislative programs which support improved school and public library service." I move the motion.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

A PARTICIPANT: I have an amendment to this motion. Taking the first "Be it resolved," second line: "and administrators should establish policies for cooperation," and adding to that: "and for instructional programs for children in the usage of the library."

I think this is important because if you look at the third "Whereas," they ask for comprehensive programs for instruction. That's not carried out in the body of the resolution. Also, if you note that instruction was a priority item in Theme II, and it didn't get up to this area, I think we can move it into this resolution. I move for adoption of this amendment.

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The amendment passes. Now we go to you, sir.

MR. OAKES: I'm Donald Oakes from Oregon. I am opposed to what was read from Theme II. I wonder how many schools want the State to set up Federal guidelines for all their libraries. That is the wording that I am opposed to. I am not opposed to the idea of having most of what was in that amendment in it, but I am opposed to the wording of Federal guidelines for States.

MR. REGGIE: Are you making a motion to strike that insertion?

MR. OAKES: I suggest that we leave with the States the right to set the standards and the guidelines and eliminate the words "implementing Federal guidelines."

MS. MALVERN: Kathryn Malvern from New Jersey. The intent of this, as I worked with the theme session on this resolution, was that the local communities would indeed write their own programs, just within the State guidelines.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you.

MS. MOSER: Marilyn Moser of the District of Columbia. This was a very important part of the Theme II. We worked that in. We also would like Mr. Dillon to insert that "in each school library there be a certified school librarian."

MS. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I'm Ann Lynch from Nevada. I urge that you defeat the insertion section because of the one word which is in there, the mandate by Congress to every school district, because I do not want Congress mandating to my local school district, whether I design the guidelines or not.

MR REGGIE: Thank you, ma'am. Now the Chair will recognize the gentleman for purposes of making his amendment.

MR. OAKES: In this proposed draft, I will read it the way I understand it and then I will reread it the way I think it should be, if that's okay.

MR. REGGIE: No. It's up on the screen. Just read the way you want the amendment.

A PARTICIPANT: It's only on one screen.

MR. DILLON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. They have only been able to produce on the transparencies on the right screen.

MR. REGGIE: With your permission, we will pass number eight and come back and get it. We will go on to the next resolution and pick up number eight, because we are not in posture now to pass it. I will come back to you, though, sir. You will be first on the agenda.

We will move now to number nine, and I would like to hear from Ms. Nancy Lorenzi, who will discuss "The Library of Congress and National Planning."

MS. LORENZI: "Therefore be it resolved, that Congress designate the Library of Congress to provide leadership in the development of plans for such services as a national depository for all governmental publications, a national periodicals center, a national referral center, and a national library network, and that the State library agencies be designated as integral participants in the planning and development of national services and as leaders in the planning of State and local services."

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the resolution. It has been moved for adoption. Are you ready to vote?

A PARTICIPANT: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REGGIE: Do you propose an amendment?

THE PARTICIPANT: No, I am speaking to the resolution. There are several things in here that directly conflict with what we adopted in number seven. This is giving the leadership for development, coordination, and planning to the Library of Congress, and in number seven we were giving that to the United States Department of

Education. And this clearly specifies development of a national network; the other one does not. I think it is clearly in conflict. I don't think we can have both of them, unless we're going to look pretty silly saying, "do this," on the one hand, and "do something directly conflicting with it," on the other.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote on the resolution?

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment. It seems that every State had this in their resolutions, but it's never come up at the Conference. So I am now offering a very short amendment that the Library of Congress officially be designated the National Library.

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: That is his motion. Is there a second.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of designating the Library of Congress as a National Library signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The amendment fails. Okay. All those in favor of resolution number nine as indicated on your sheets, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nays have it and number nine fails. We will ask you to turn back now to number eight, where we made that insertion. I think we have the wording up on the transparencies. The Chair recognizes the gentleman at microphone four.

MR. OAKES: I would make that a motion to amend it so that it would read: "Congress shall set guidelines for the establishment of a school library in each school. States will implement guidelines and set standards for libraries in all schools and evaluate local efforts. Local school districts will plan and implement an appropriate program for their community which fits within the State guidelines."

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the amendment. Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote? All in favor of that amendment, please turn to A; those opposed, turn to B; those abstaining, turn to C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

It passes 243 to 150, with 77 abstentions.

MS. CADE: Mr. Chairman, I'm Barbara Cade from Georgia. This whole section has been garbled. I think that's the problem with all of it. Could we refer this to the editorial committee to go back and work on it after this? It has left out a lot of the other information that is necessary in there. It should have an addition of a certified school librarian. Those were things that were passed upon in the whole theme committee, and it's just all mixed up.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you, ma'am.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I have been informed by persons who drafted some of this material that the text that they gave me this morning to insert was incomplete, and they have an additional sentence to add. I will read that sentence.

MR. REGGIE: Are you making a motion?

THE PARTICIPANT: I am moving an amendment on their behalf.

MR. REGGIE: Okay.

THE PARTICIPANT: You will recall that I inserted a paragraph into what you have in front of you on page eight and that was projected on at least this screen. It is now proposed that just preceding that, as a part of that paragraph, there be the following sentence: "Be it further resolved, that library services for small schools be provided through cooperative arrangements contracted among school districts and/or through regional service centers to ensure certified teacher librarians and adequate resources." That is a motion, sir.

A PARTICIPANT: I second it.

MR. REGGIE: All right, you have a motion. It has been seconded. As many of you as are in favor of that motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it, and that is adopted. Now we will go to the main motion as amended. If there be no objection, we are ready to vote. As many of you as are in favor of the adoption of number eight, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Thank you, and the ayes have it. Now we move to number 10, "Technology," which will be presented by Mr. Duane Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: "Therefore be it resolved, that the Federal Government direct all federally supported libraries and information services and other appropriate Federal agencies to support the development, review, and adoption of national and international standards for publishing, producing, organizing, storing, and transmitting information, using established and recognized procedures and institutions; and

"Be it further resolved, that high priority attention be given to establishing or extending standards which address hardware and software compatibility, computer and communications network protocols, and machine readable information; and

"Be it further resolved, that the private sector be encouraged to participate and to support the development of such standards; and

"Be it further resolved, that research be funded to develop new technologies that permit convenient and economic media conversion from and to media-like print, microfiche, magnetic, optical, voice, etc."

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I have two corrections to the resolution as it was written. The last "Whereas" should be a "Resolved." I think that's a typographical error, and that makes a substantive change to the whole resolution.

MR. REGGIE: Are you amending to say that the last "Whereas" would now say: "Be it resolved, that individuals, organizations," etc.?

THE PARTICIPANT: Yes, sir.

MR. REGGIE: Do you want to accept that as a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection?

(No response.)

Then it is so ordered.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I think that in combining the resolutions from Theme III, number three, and Theme V, number three, you really combine apples and oranges together. It's going to be very confusing for those of us that have to go back and pinpoint the resolutions. Is there some mechanism whereby we can separate the two resolutions already passed? Otherwise, I will have to go through the process of doing all the amendments to this resolution. Can we restore the original wording in the two resolutions that are combined by the Resolutions Committee?

MR. REGGIE: We can do this, if you make a motion. I will ask the parliamentarian for a ruling. What we are trying to do is allow a vote on Theme III, number three, and Theme V, number three, and let the body vote on them separately, because all of you have them in your possession. I think we can do it if we have unanimous consent.

(Chorus of nays.)

There is not unanimous consent. Now the parliamentarian will tell us how to do it. The parliamentarian tells me that if you ask me to do it by unanimous consent, I can present it to the assembly. You just asked me; I heard you. Would you want to do it by unanimous consent?

(Chorus of nays.)

Okay, the answer is no. The majority may split them and discuss them separately and vote on them separately. If you ask us to do that now, we will ask for a majority vote of the delegates. Would you please go to your machines? If you vote yes, you will be voting to split this resolution, to as it was presented in Theme III, number three, and Theme V, number three. If you vote no, you are voting to preserve. And if you abstain, you're chicken.

(Laughter.)

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

104 vote yes, to split; 246 vote not to split, to keep it together; and 13 abstain.

The question has been asked. Is there any objection to taking up the question?

(No response.)

All in favor of the motion as presented, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then it passes. Let's go to number 11, which will be presented by Mr. Duane Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: "Therefore be it resolved, that the President: 1) make a report on governmental agencies engaged in these activities"—described in the "Whereases"—"and attendant costs; and 2) make recommendations to eliminate duplication of effort and waste and to expand coverage where appropriate; and

"Be it further resolved, that on the basis of this report, the President formulate necessary procedures to coordinate United States participation in international communication and information programs, both public and private."

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: It has been moved and seconded. Does anybody want to speak to the motion?

A PARTICIPANT: I would like to offer an amendment. I am against this resolution as it stands, and I would like to offer an amendment that would delete "2)" and the next "Resolved."

MR. REGGIE: And substitute what?

THE PARTICIPANT: "That procedures be developed to ensure that libraries play a key role in serving to coordinate efficiently and disseminate impartially information both nationally and internationally." I think that as it stands, the resolution negates the role of the library in providing information to the community and in general.

MR. REGGIE: Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote on the amendment? As many of you as are in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it. The amendment fails. Are you ready to vote on the main resolution? As many of you as are in favor of number 11 as presented, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It passes. We are going now to number 12, which will be given by Mr. Robert Navarro.

MR. NAVARRO: "Therefore be it resolved, that a new Federal program be enacted and funded which would provide for an exchange and training program for library and information service personnel; and

"Be it further resolved, that protocol for library and information exchange in the United States support the participation in Universal Availability of Publications and encourage the elimination of trade and other barriers to the exchange of library materials of all kinds; and

"Be it further resolved, that as Federal and State programs for networking are established that consideration for international communication and sharing be included within the framework of the networks which are created; and

"Be it further resolved, that Federal funds should be made available for the implementation of international networking."

MR. REGGIE: The lady at microphone two is recognized.

A PARTICIPANT: I have an amendment to propose, which would delete the words "library materials" in the first "further resolved" paragraph, at the end of "elimination of trade and other barriers to the exchange of."

MR. REGGIE: And then do what?

THE PARTICIPANT: And put just "exchange of information of all kinds."

MR. REGGIE: The amendment is to strike the two words "library materials" in the second resolved paragraph and insert instead the word "information."

THE PARTICIPANT: Can I explain why I would do that? It seems to me that the international recommendations of this body have been too narrowly construing the problems. It seems to me that the Third World and other countries are more interested in kinds of information that don't necessarily come from libraries, and that we should take some positive stance to redress the imbalances that exist in international exchange of information of all kinds, not just library materials.

MS. LOWRIE: Jean Lowrie from Michigan. I agree with your concept, but this is in for a particular reason. Under the Florence Protocol, it is possible to import books and print materials, but it does not make it possible to import nonprint materials; therefore, that phrase "library materials" is a specific identification of the kind of thing that needs to be included for free trade barriers.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote?

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that, for clarification, if the person making that amendment would accept an alteration, we leave "library materials" in there and simply add "information." Let both stand.

A PARTICIPANT: That's fine.

MR. REGGIE: Is that a friendly amendment?

A PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Then if there is no objection to the adoption, we will keep the words "library materials" and we will insert "and information." That is a friendly amendment and it is so adopted. Are you ready to vote on the main resolution? As many of you as are in favor of number 12 as amended, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Thank you, and it passes. We will now go to number 14, because we have already taken 13. Number 14 will be given by Ms. Delia Martinez.

MS. MARTINEZ: "Therefore be it resolved, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services endorses and supports the enactment of a national library act incorporating the general principles, goals, and objectives of S.1124, with such modifications as shall appear desirable after full public hearings before appropriate congressional committees; and

"Be it further resolved, that Congress be requested to hold regional hearings to consider such matters as: the definition of a library; categorical funding for rural, sparsely populated, or impacted areas; a proposed funding formula; and the structure and representation of a national committee or a national advisory board, including the matter of lay and library related persons and special constituencies."

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, there has been so much discussion of this in the past four days, as well as prior to that, I do not think that there is a single argument that could be made for or against this that we haven't all already heard, so I call the question.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to the question?

(No response.)

If you favor number 14's adoption, please click to A; if you are opposed, please click to B; and if you abstain, please click to C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

369, yes; 108, no; and 16 abstentions. It is adopted. We now go to number 15 on "Public Awareness." We call on Mr. Marcus Salazar of Oklahoma.

MR. SALAZAR: "Therefore be it resolved, that in order to accommodate the desired increase in public awareness, the following activities, projects and proposals should be undertaken:

"1) develop and implement an aggressive, comprehensive national public awareness campaign, coordinated at the federal level, and involving the following: A) Library Administration Office, United States Department of Education; B) State library agencies; C) local library units; D) national, State, and local friends groups of the library; E) ALA and other library-related organizations; F) national, State, and local organizations representative of all segments of society; G) to adopt a national library symbol to be disseminated nationally; H) inform the public about existing library and information services which are needed but unavailable.

"2) implementation of model (or demonstration) projects to be administered and developed by libraries in concert with community organizations dealing with effective public awareness programs;

"3) the assimilation of libraries into broad-based community projects and programs utilizing the most effective means of creating public awareness of libraries to all segments of the community;

"4) establishment of policy requiring libraries requesting Federal monies to include effective and viable public awareness programs and activities to publicize programs to intended service recipients;

"5) training of professionals in human relations, effective use of public relations, and marketing techniques necessary to increase public usage of library services;

"6) provision for national, regional, State, and local planning consultants and specialsts to be made available to local libraries when needed, in order to increase effectiveness of existing and proposed programs;

"7) promote and encourage cooperation with volunteer organizations and use of trained volunteers;

"8) formation of planning groups reflective of communities, specifically those segments that are underserved or unserved, to initiate needs assessment and to assist in the development of programs to effectively meet those needs;

"9) utilization of all local, State, regional, and national agencies, organizations and groups representative of special constituencies in attaining necessary support, political clout, and simultaneously providing an instrument for further assessment and increasing awareness; and

"Be it further resolved that:

"1) the percentage of funds allocated to each State for the administration of library programs be increased by a fixed percentage to be allocated to a professional public information program using multi-media, to be jointly sponsored by State library associations and State library agencies, and that State library associations will administer the funds;

"2) in order to adequately plan these programs, there should be a statewide planning committee appointed by the governor, with two-thirds lay members and one-third librarians and trustees. These statewide public information efforts should be coordinated at the national level through a public relations arm of the Office of Library and Information Services under an Assistant Secretary of Education. The American Library Association should be involved as the national professional organization."

MR. REGGIE: I recognize the lady at number four.

MS. EASTMAN: Thank you. Ann Eastman, citizen delegate from Virginia. We have carried a typographical error from the first draft of this resolution. On page 15, under "Be it further resolved that," item one, next to the last line, should read: "State library agencies will administer the funds." It is a simple typo.

MR. REGGIE: Instead of "associations"?

MS. EASTMAN: Correct.

MR. REGGIE: Will we accept that as a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: All right, then it is so ordered.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend, hopefully in a friendly fashion, the first item, which begins: "develop and implement an aggressive, comprehensive national public awareness campaign." I would suggest that that read "nationwide public awareness campaign."

And also, rather than: "coordinated at the Federal level," "coordinated by the ALA and the following."

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: You were doing okay, I think, until you got to that last point.

THE PARTICIPANT: The reason for suggesting that, sir, is that the words "national" and "federal" imply that this program may ultimately come from the new Office of Education. If it does, it's likely that those materials will never get on television; and if they aren't on the air, they will do libraries no good.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to changing the word "national" to "nationwide" as a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: Do you want to make the other as an amendment?

THE PARTICIPANT: I would do that, sir.

MR. REGGIE: Then there is an amendment that we strike the words "at the Federal level" to the words "coordinated by the ALA." As many of you as are in favor of striking "at the Federal level" and substituting in place thereof "by the ALA," signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it.

MS. GIAGNI: Mr. Chairman, my name is Ann Giagni. I am here as a delegate-at-large representing the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, which is a public employee union. On the first "Resolved," I submit as an amendment that we strike number seven.

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: Do you want to make that as a motion, ma'am?

MS. GIAGNI: Yes, I do.

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the motion that we strike number seven that provides for volunteer organizations. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It does not pass.

MR. VASSALLO: Paul Vassallo from New Mexico. I would like to point out that a very significant sector in the library and information services is not included in this. I would like to offer an amendment in the "Therefore be it resolved," number one, right after "C) local library units," to include "academic and research libraries."

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to the insertion of it as a friendly amendment?

(No response.)

There is no objection, so it is a friendly amendment.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, we have little money at the present time to even buy books. We also have a lot of committees and a lot of bureaucracy. I would therefore strike completely the second "Therefore be it resolved" at the bottom of the page. It's ridiculous. It takes away more Federal money to publicity, and what we need is books.

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the motion. Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: There is a motion now to delete everything a paragraph nine totally. All in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The motion fails.

MR. LANDAU: Herbert Landau, delegate-at-large representing the American Society for Information Science. On the second page under "Be it further resolved," I would like to make an amendment that the last sentence of number two, "The American Library Association should be involved as the national professional organization," be deleted; and substitute for that, "National professional organizations should be involved."

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it, and the motion passes.

A PARTICIPANT: Two brief friendly amendments to clarify on the first page. Under "Therefore be it resolved," 1(D), to distinguish from our Quaker constituencies it might read, "national, State, and local Friends of the Library groups."

MR. REGGIE: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: All right, then it is so ordered.

THE PARTICIPANT: And to 1(G): "to adopt a library symbol for the Nation," instead of a "National Library symbol."

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to adopting that as a friendly amendment? We accept that as a friendly amendment.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I have a friendly amendment to offer. Between (C) and (D) on page one, I would like to include not only academic and research libraries, which were mentioned earlier, but special libraries, which represent Federal libraries and the libraries in the private sector. They are an important part of the information community.

MR. REGGIE: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection?

(No response.)

Okay, it is so ordered.

A PARTICIPANT: Friendly amendment. I would like to include school libraries also. I do not feel that they are included under academic.

MR. REGGIE: Is that a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection?

(No response.)

Then it is so ordered.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that this particular resolution has now been so emasculated that it is difficult to know what we're voting on. I am in favor of the general principle, but opposed to the adoption of this one. I do not think we need it. We have covered it in the national provision for the Senate Study Bill. We have covered it in terms of relationship with the United States Department of Education. We will certainly be able to get at it in any regional meetings that are held. I think this is unnecessary and we ought to just vote it down.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you, sir.

A PARTICIPANT: In the final "Be it further resolved," number one, I see a mathematical problem. I would suggest the deletion of the first percentage to correct it. It would then read, "The funds allocated to each State for the administration of library programs be increased by a fixed percentage."

MR. REGGIE: Is that a friendly amendment?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. Are we ready for the question?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: As many of you as are in favor of adopting the resolution as amended by all those friends, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it, and it passes. We will move along. Would Mr. Salazar please go to the next one?

MR. SALAZAR: Number 16: "Be it resolved, that the President propose and Congress approve:

"1) that for Fiscal Year 1981 there be no reduction in funding and/or full funding of the Library Services and Construction Act, appropriate titles of the Higher Education Act, and Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the National Library of Medicine program;

"2) new federal funding which would authorize: A) innovative demonstration projects, such as research and community needs assessment projects, cultural awareness projects, age level consultant projects, and youth incentive projects; B) elementary and secondary school libraries and certified staff library instruction and media programs; and C) new funding for academic libraries;

"3) Federal funding formulas which would include: A) special support for rural, urban, and economically deprived areas; B) criteria of population, geography, local participation, need, and the ability to pay; and C) requirements of State and local responsibility;

"4) Federal postal and telecommunication rates for delivery and/or return of library, informational, and educational materials to noncontiguous or isolated areas should be reduced;

"5) Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-B, should be designated as categorical aid for school libraries."

MR. MILLENSON: Mr. Chairman, Roy Millenson, delegate-at-large. I should like to propose an amendment for the first "Resolved" clause, the section which is marked number one. At the end add: "And be it further resolved, that this resolution be transmitted immediately to the President and to the Office of Management and Budget."

The reason for that amendment is best contained in the sheet that was passed out by the American Library Association yesterday, showing that the White House, the Budget Office, and the President himself are contemplating a reduction of $73 million in the budget for library programs. Those decisions are being made now. We should not wait for this resolution to be transmitted.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to the adoption of the amendment?

(No response.)

If there is no objection, then we will accept it as a very friendly one.

MR. RICE: A friendly amendment, Mr. Chairman. John Rice from Louisiana. In the first "Be it resolved," number one, the first line, after "1981," add "and subsequent years."

MR. REGGIE: We will accept that as a friendly amendment, Mr. Rice.

MR. BRUNJES: Kenneth Brunjes from Pennsylvania. On the basis that there is no free lunch, I recommend the deletion of item number four. Special rates for special interest groups will shift the cost of those services to the other users of those services.

MR. REGGIE: The gentleman makes a motion. All in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed to deleting number four, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

All right, that loses.

MS. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, Ruth Jackson from Virginia. Point of information. In item 3(B) under "Resolved," what is meant by "geography?"

MR. REGGIE: I think they had in mind distances. I think the word will just have to stand on its own, unless you want some definition of the word.

MS. JACKSON: I want to question another, the "local participation." It seems to me that that is redundant, in that you've got "requirements for State and local responsibility." I move that that statement be struck, just the words "local participation."

MR. REGGIE: The lady makes a motion that we strike the words "local participation" from 3(B).

MS. JACKSON: In that it is covered in (C).

MR. REGGIE: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Okay, then it remains and that fails.

MS. REEVES: Joan Reeves, lay delegate from Rhode Island. I think we may have two typos here. The first one is, and I suppose we call that a friendly amendment, under "Be it resolved" (1): "for Fiscal Year 1981 there be no reduction in funding and/or full funding," could be read to mean there be no full funding. May I suggest that we change that to "there be full funding," to make it make sense?

MR. REGGIE: Okay. Do you want to accept that as the amendment? All in favor of making the amendment change, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then we will make the change.

MS. REEVES: I had another one I think is a typo.

A PARTICIPANT: Call for the question.

MR. REGGIE: Make this last one, and with your permission we are going to go to the question because we really are taking an awful long time.

MS. REEVES: It may be a typographical error.

MR. REGGIE: If it is, the staff will clean it up, is what I'm trying to say. If you have a suggestion afterwards, just drop it off and tell our Resolutions Committee about it.

MS. HOLMES: I'm Helen Holmes, lay delegate from Oklahoma, and I propose a very friendly amendment. In the sentence "Be it resolved," as it reads it seems that we are mandating that the President do something. I suggest and I move that we add after the word "that" the words "we request the President to propose and the Congress to approve."

MR. REGGIE: Do you make that as a motion, ma'am?

MS. HOLMES: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(No response.)

And those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The amendment fails. Now we are going to move the previous question. Is that all right with everybody? I don't want to cut anybody off.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a simple friendly amendment. Under 2(B), where it states "certified library staff," there are thousands upon thousands of librarians who are not certified who certainly read the instruction. It should be "all library staff."

MR. REGGIE: The gentleman's amendment is that we strike the word "certified" in paragraph 2(B) and insert the word "all." All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it. It does not pass. We now move the previous question. All in favor of the resolution as friendly amended, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then it passes. Those of you who had any housekeeping or good friendly amendments for it, you can just check with the Resolutions Committee up here and they will do it. Okay Mr. Salazar, would you go on to the next one?

MR. SALAZAR: Delegates, I would like to present to you the last resolution from the Resolutions Committee: "Therefore be it resolved, that local and State priorities be reordered to respond to increasing need for excellence and wide use of library and information services. This reordering must result in improved funding for all types of nonprofit library and information services, with significantly heavier shares borne by the States."

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote on that? As many of you as are in favor of the resolution as indicated, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

I think the ayes have it; therefore we declare it passed. That takes us through those 17.

A PARTICIPANT: Point of information, Mr. Chairman. There are ten of us who are going to have to leave probably before we get through our next order of business, because we are testifying before the Congressional Hearing. I would like on our behalf to know what is the procedure for using the paper ballot. When and where can we turn those in, because I'm sure we're not going to get to those before we leave?

MR. REGGIE: Please cast them and leave them in the box at the door by five o'clock.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman and members of the body, I have been considering a move to reconsider the "National Information Policy" resolution that we passed, because I was concerned that the statement, point number four, regarding local control, was ambiguous and could be in conflict with our reaffirmation of first amendment rights. Several people I talked to felt that that could imply censorship. I don't know quite how to resolve that, but I think it's a very, very important issue, and I wanted to put it before the body.

MR. REGGIE: We have declared at this point, however, that you are out of order. If you want to bring it up at the end, we have some other business that we will be taking up.

We have a procedural question and I would like to have your approval. There are ten delegates of this Conference who have been invited to testify before the congressional committee. They have asked that they have the right to vote outside of the room on a paper ballot that would be counted in considering the resolutions that are going to be coming up now brought up by petition. Do you understand what our problem is? What is your pleasure? Do I take it that you will allow the voting of those ten persons?

(Chorus of ayes.)

The only thing is, I have no machinery for sending for your ballots each time.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest on that that only if a vote is sufficiently close that our votes would make a difference in the outcome.

MR. REGGIE: I want to make this clear because I don't want to break faith. I have no machinery to send for your votes.

THE PARTICIPANT: You have no runners available? May I suggest that we ask for a volunteer from the alternates?

284

MR. REGGIE: You may do anything you choose to get those ballots here to me, and I will count them. All I ask you to do is you take the responsibility about getting them.

A PARTICIPANT: I volunteer if a vote is within ten votes of being passed.

MR. REGGIE: There is your volunteer right there. Now, we have reached the hour of 10:55. We are going to extend the meeting so we can get through with this business. Do we have unanimous consent to extend the meeting?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: All right, thank you. We will spend the time necessary to get through this next item.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I voted on the prevailing side of the "National Information Policy" resolution on page two, and I move to reconsider it for purposes of clearing up the censorship issue in the amendment, point number four.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: The motion is to reconsider resolution number two

THE PARTICIPANT: Item four.

MR. REGGIE: We need a simple majority to reconsider this matter, according to the parliamentarian; therefore, on the gentleman's motion to reconsider resolution number two, I ask you to go to your voting machines and put them on abstain. If you want to reconsider, please click to A. If you do not want to reconsider, go to B. And if you do not want to vote, go to C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

173 vote yes, to reconsider; 207 vote no; and 44 abstain. Therefore, there will be no reconsideration of number two.

A PARTICIPANT: Point of information on the resolutions which are coming up by petition. Will they be read from the podium?

MR. REGGIE: If that's all right with everybody. Unless there is an objection, I will read the "Resolved" section and move it along.

We have petition resolution number one, which you have been furnished. We need a two-thirds vote to consider it; therefore, I ask all those in favor of considering it, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed?

(Chorus of nays.)

We rule that there are in fact two-thirds voting in favor.

"Be it resolved, that: 1) a White House or a Federal Conference on Library and Information Services be held every decade to establish the national information goals and priorities for the next decade, to assure effective transfer of knowledge to the citizenry and to establish this goal in light of accelerated changes in information, technology and practices; and 2) an interim Conference be held every five years, under the aegis of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, to assess the national progress made in implementation of the recommendations of the preceding National Conference and the progress in providing library and information services to the citizenry, and to project further improved services in the light of national needs." Anybody want to speak to that?

MS. BERGER: My name is Patricia Berger, and I'm a delegate-at-large for the Federal information community. This reflects a resolution passed by our pre-White House Conference in July. I think it's important to continue the dialogue we have begun here. This is the first time in our history that not only all segments of the information community, but the lay people who are for us and against us, have come together to talk. I think it would be absolutely criminal if we went home without providing for ourselves a way to address future national needs, and I submit we cannot wait another 25 years before we get back together.

MR. REGGIE: Does anybody want to speak against it?

MR. RAYNOLDS: Mr. Chairman, David Raynolds from Wyoming. I move to strike the second paragraph.

MR. REGGIE: There is a motion to strike the second paragraph.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: It's duly seconded. All in favor of striking the second paragraph, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then it passes. The second paragraph is stricken.

A PARTICIPANT: I have a comment. I feel that it would be more effective if we not have White House Conferences every ten years. I think that the second resolution, which you will see in your packet, will probably be more effective. In that, it would be a small group getting together, and this group would work toward the implementation of the goals. But I don't see where just getting a large number of people at a large expense just to talk would be really in our best interests every ten years.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you.

MS. PAUL: Linda Paul, delegate from Idaho. I disagree with the previous speaker, because a small state like Idaho really requires this kind of national visibility and the opportunity to meet with other state delegations. In addition, we need to provide this continuing dialogue at the national level with the White House support, with that kind of importance, for the development of public policy which reflects the most critical place of information and access.

MR. REGGIE: Okay. We have had a speaker for and against. Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the resolution as amended, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, signify by saying no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it, a simple majority on the passing.

We go now to number two. All in favor of considering number two, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It passes with two-thirds. "Be it resolved, that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science convene an ad hoc committee composed of delegates elected by each delegation to the WHCLIS. The ad hoc committee shall be responsible for planning and monitoring Conference follow-up activities."

Are you ready to vote on that resolution?

THE PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: Is there any objection to voting?

MR. BRAUDE: Robert Braude, delegate from Nebraska. It's not an objection to this resolution, but there is something in the Conference Rules that provides for this exact practice, which we all adopted on Thursday. If you look at the Conference Rules, it says the general Resolutions Committee shall be responsible for follow-up and planning of future Conferences. Those rules were passed by this body.

MS. SLOCUM: May I speak to that point? Grace Slocum. I was the one who developed this particular resolution. We were very aware of the rule. We were going to propose this originally as a substitution for that rule. That committee, if you look at it, has a very narrow charge. This resolution, we feel, opens up a follow-up committee that would take into account the vast knowledge and enthusiasm that all of the delegates have brought to this Conference. The language is purposely vague, because it would allow for each delegation to elect a representative to that committee. It does not require that you do so. It's very permissive. The National Commission is in favor of this and might find a way to have more than 57.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you. Are you ready to vote? As many of you as are in favor of the resolution, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It passes. We will now go to number three. All in favor of considering number three, signify by saying aye.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, that is not necessary. The Pennsylvania delegation, which proposed this resolution, is happy to see that all of its requests have been voted affirmatively. We withdraw it.

MR. REGGIE: It has been withdrawn from the files by the proponents. All in favor of considering number four, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the good sense of the body. This has already been accepted. There is no need to just repeat it, and I ask the New Jersey delegation to withdraw it.

MR. REGGIE: It has been disclosed that it's redundant. Those who want to consider it signify by saying aye.

(No response.)

Those who are opposed to considering it, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then the nos have it. We move to five.

With your permission we will read the "Resolved" section, and then ask you what you want to do: "Be it resolved, that this Conference recognizes the urgent need to formulate information policies for the people of the United States and charges the NCLIS to consult with other agencies and organizations to formulate such policies and propose necessary legislative action." Do you want to consider it? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it. We move on now to number six: "Resolved, that Congress is requested to renew the authorization for funding the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and to increase the funding for this Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities so that their essential contributions for preserving and making accessible the historical records of the nations can be continued and expanded." All in favor of considering this matter, signify by saying yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then we will consider it.

A PARTICIPANT: Call for the question.

MR. REGGIE: The question has been called for. Do you want to speak to this, sir?

MR. WELDON: Yes, sir. There is a critical error in the last line. I'm the sponsor, Edward Weldon. That should be "Nation," singular.

MR. REGGIE: We will accept it as a friendly amendment. All in favor of the resolution signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, please say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it. Number six is duly adopted.

MS. SWARTZ: Mr. Chairman, my name is Renee Swartz. I'm Chairman of the New Jersey delegation. We would like to withdraw the next proposal as being passed, and we are very pleased about that.

MR. REGGIE: And we are too. Number seven is withdrawn. We move to number eight.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, yesterday we directed the Resolutions Committee to try to synthesize both the Theme session resolutions and the petition resolutions.

MS. LONDON: We did not merge them, but we went through the petitions and we did list where we felt they were totally unique and where we thought they were incorporated. We cannot tell you right now where they have been incorporated. We did not have time to write it all out.

MR. REGGIE: On number eight did you have any?

MS. LONDON: On number eight, we felt that that was incorporated in several resolutions.

MR. REGGIE: On number eight, the Resolutions Committee reports that that was incorporated in several resolutions. Do you want to consider it? Those in favor of considering it, say yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

All right, then, we will bypass it. Number nine clearly has been considered in that long resolution that was a joint product that was adopted this morning, I think unanimously. Do you want to consider it? Those who want to consider number nine, vote yes.

(No response.)

Those who want to pass it, vote no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then we are not considering that one. On number 10, does the Resolutions Committee have an observation?

MS. LONDON: Yes, we feel that it was considered.

MR. REGGIE: The Resolutions Committee has reported that number 10 has been covered and is redundant.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, the title of number 10 was put on it by the typing pool and is not an accurate reflection of the sense of this resolution. This resolution deals with the concept of free library service in a free society, and it really should need no further explanation. I move that we consider this resolution on its merits.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of considering it, vote yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

All opposed, vote no.

(Chorus of nays.)

I think the nos have it. It certainly doesn't have two-thirds. We now move to number 11. Would the Resolutions Committee give us their report?

MS. LINSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of information. I'm Priscilla Linsley from New Jersey, sponsor of this resolution. There is a serious omission. It was left untitled. The title should be "Library Services for Institutionalized Individuals."

MR. REGGIE: That, I think, was covered by amendment this morning.

MS. LONDON: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: All in favor of considering number 11, say yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it. We now move to number 12. Would the Resolutions Committee give us a report, please?

MS. LONDON: It was unique.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, this is also in the paper ballot. It might be easier for the purposes of expedition to leave it on the paper ballot, where it would be considered and voted upon.

MR. REGGIE: The point made is that it's on the paper ballot and that you will have a chance to vote for it there. All in favor of considering it, signify by saying yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The Chair rules that there are two-thirds and that we will consider it. Now we will read the "Resolved" clause: "Therefore be it resolved, that the Congress be asked to enact a National Indian Omnibus Library Bill to include:

"1) a title on training, both pre-service and in-service, to be determined by tribes, Alaska natives, and Aleuts in collaboration with higher education agencies that leads to certification for Indian library workers, and that tribes and their designated Indian organizations and institutions shall be included in such programs. Particular emphasis would be on continuing education and career development, on-the-job experience, and work study;

"2) a title on historical and contemporary materials and dissemination of information in all formats;

"3) a title on construction or remodeling of library/information/cultural resource facilities;

"4) a title on technical assistance to be provided to new or developing libraries;

"5) a title on the support of library/information services to Indian studies programs in institutions of higher education;

"6) a title providing financial support to Indian communities, both urban and rural, as a means of conducting information needs surveys in building a base for library development;

"7) special purpose program grants and contracts; and

"8) a title establishing a National Indian Library Center that would do the following: A) implement the BIA Plan for library/ media/information services development as continuously modified, monitored, and reevaluated by the tribal governments operating under it; B) serve as a stimulus and focal point for the preservation, production, collection, and distribution of materials of interest to Indian libraries; C) operate as a clearinghouse and referral center for materials (including oral history and language materials); D) provide technical assistance through a bank of Indian resource people who can provide intensive, short-term help; E) facilitate a national network capability; F) establish links between the National Indian Library Center and high school and college counselors regarding Indian students and library career training opportunities; and G) encourage a horizontal approach to information access funding within BIA, so that health, social services, economic development, job training, and other programs carry their own information services support components;

"The National Indian Omnibus Library Bill should be administered by the United States Department of the Interior's Office of Library and Information Services in line with policies established by tribal governing boards."

A PARTICIPANT: I move the question.

MR. REGGIE: The question has been moved.

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favor of this motion. As we know, this is the one large community that has been excluded from library services. It really is the responsibility at the federal level to provide library services on or near the reservation. We would like your support in seeing that this kind of service is delivered to the community.

(Applause.)

MS. BERGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm Patricia Berger, delegate for the Federal information community. I would like to concur in what my colleague said, and I would like also to add that this bill is long over due.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote? As many of you as are in favor of the resolution signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It passes. Let me just point out to you that we will strike that out on the paper ballot; and in the event that persons vote it down on the paper ballot, it will still have passed.

All right, we are on number 13. What is the Resolution Committee's observations?

MS. LONDON: First I have to say that we only went up to 16 last night, because we didn't have any others; but "Youth Caucus" was unique.

MR. REGGIE: All right. "Be it resolved, that there be at least one youth appointee named to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a voting member, and that States be encouraged to include youths on their library boards as voting members, and that local governments be encouraged to include at least one youth as a voting member on the local library board."

I now need a two-thirds vote if we are going to consider a vote on the resolution. All in favor of considering number 13, signify by aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

I think the two-thirds have it. Now, all in favor of the adoption of the resolution, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The ayes have it. We go now to number 14. What is the Resolution Committee's report on number 14?

MS. LONDON: We felt that the "People's Library Bill of Rights" was incorporated.

MR. REGGIE: I won't go through the whole resolution, because you have it there and I think you know what it is. I need your permission whether to consider it or not. Let's go to the machines, please. Please put them on the abstain position. If you want to consider the "People's Library Bill of Rights," vote A; if you do not want to consider, vote B; and if you abstain, vote C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

181, yes; 146, no; and 6 abstentions. I will ask the parliamentarian to make a ruling.

It loses. It does not have two-thirds in favor, and therefore we move now to take up number 15: "Be it resolved, that the White House Conference hereby reaffirms the role of school and public libraries as not only an educational resource, but also a recreational resource committed to providing the public with a wide range of books, periodicals, and other kinds of traditional library resources." What does the Resolutions Committee report?

MS. LONDON: We felt that this was unique.

MR. REGGIE: If you want this matter taken up, please vote yes; if you don't, vote no. I need two-thirds. All in favor of considering it, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it, and therefore we bypass it. On number 16, what is the position of the Resolutions Committee?

MS. LONDON: We felt this was unique also.

MR. REGGIE: The Resolutions Committee found this unique. I will read you the resolved portion: "Now therefore be it resolved, that: An office staffed with Spanish-speaking professional librarians be instituted within the National Library Agency to address the library and information needs of the Spanish-speaking, and that this office be authorized to act in the following capacity:

"1) to coordinate national projects aimed at the Spanish-speaking;

"2) to collect and disseminate information on local, State, and national projects;

"3) to collect data for purposes of evaluating and reporting on the status of library and information services to the Spanish-speaking in the country; and

"4) to serve as a direct liaison between the Spanish-speaking communities, the library profession, libraries serving the Spanish-speaking, and the Federal Government."

I need a two-thirds vote if we are going to consider it. Go to the machines, please, and put your machines on abstain. If you want to consider this resolution, please put your machine on A; if you are opposed to considering it, put it on B; if you do not want to vote, put it on C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

219, yes; 160, no; and 6 abstentions. The two-thirds have not been reached; therefore, it fails. On number 17, does the Resolutions Committee have any recommendation?

MS. LONDON: Unfortunately, that's where we stopped. We had no other resolutions last night.

MR. REGGIE: All right. We will read the resolved: "Resolved, that all delegates, alternates, observers, and other participants in the White House Conference on Library and Information Services make it their immediate goal that no pupil in their State or Territory shall finish this school year without coming to know and, as much as possible, to feel at home in a neighborhood library, and

"Be it further resolved, that each participant in the Conference shall take it upon himself or herself to enlist the support of the State or Territory's parents, librarians, teachers, public administrations, private associations and businesses, and other appropriate instrumentalities to accomplish this definite goal."

All in favor of taking up number 17, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It does not meet the two-third rule, and therefore it will not be considered. We have number 18.

A PARTICIPANT: In light of the fact, on the resolution on Hispanic affairs, that more people voted to consider it than not consider it, could we add it as a separate thing to the paper ballot? Can I make a motion to that effect?

MR. REGGIE: I'm going to rule you out of order, because what we add to the paper ballot is not germane to the topic that we are discussing. We are only discussing the resolutions by initiation or petition.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, if I might speak before you introduce resolution 18. I do have a means of possibly moving or acting on resolutions 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 in one fell swoop, if you will give me permission to do so.

MR. REGGIE: That's a friendly amendment.

THE PARTICIPANT: Resolutions between 18 and 21 have all been submitted by the American Library Association (ALA). Many of them have been addressed in Conference resolutions from the delegate body here. I would like to make the statement that all of these resolutions are already in the hopper and work has already begun through ALA in these areas. It's a sort of housekeeping job for what we had already implemented or started.

We would like the support of this delegation on the resolutions without withdrawing any of them.

MR. REGGIE: Okay. We'll go to 18: "Therefore be it resolved, that the White House Conference delegates respectfully urge that the United States Senate pass legislation during the 96th Congress similar to HR.79, the Postal Service Act of 1979."

I need a two-thirds vote to consider that. Go to the machines, please. Please put your machines on abstain. If you want to consider 18, vote A; if you do not want to consider, vote B; and if you want to abstain, vote C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

243 for; 140 against; and one abstention. Therefore, two-thirds have not been reached. My parliamentarian says we needed 255. There are 10 delegates who are out. If all of them voted, it would be 253. Therefore, the Chair is going to rule that even with those that are absent, if they had all voted for it, two-thirds would not be reached. So we now move to 19.

MS. MOORE: I'm Jeanne Marie Moore from Denver and I want to propose that resolutions 19, 20 and 21 have been covered in other areas. I'm making a motion to withdraw the three of them.

MR. REGGIE: Were you the proponent of those?

MS. MOORE: I made two.

MR. REGGIE: I understand. Let me do it this way. If I can get the two-thirds, then we'll see where we are. We will do it on a one-by-one basis. On number 19, if you are in favor of considering it, please say yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those who are opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it, and 19 will not be considered. Now let's go to 20, keeping in mind what the young lady just said about it being a duplication, "Libraries within the Department of Education." Do you want that read to you?

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: All right. As many of you as are in favor of considering 20, signify by voting yes.

(No response.)

And those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It will not be considered. Number 21, dealing with funding of federal library programs. Do you want it read?

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

MR. REGGIE: As many of you as are in favor of considering it, vote yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, vote no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then that also will not be considered. Now we are at number 22. It's a resolution on "Literary, Musical, and Artistic Donations to Libraries." The resolved clause is short: "Be it resolved, that the U.S. Congress enact legislation restoring a tax incentive for authors and artists to donate their creative works to libraries and museums."

As many of you as are in favor of considering this matter, please say yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Okay, then we will now consider it.

A PARTICIPANT: Call for the question.

297

MR. REGGIE: You have the matter on the floor. The question has been called for. If there is no objection, we will vote. All in favor of adopting resolution 22 as you have it, signify by voting yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, vote no.

(No response.)

Then it passes. We will go to 23. Is 23 the one that I have titled "A Resolution to Encourage?"

THE PARTICIPANTS: No.

A PARTICIPANT: Number 23 is "Resolution for Support of Education for Library and Information." It reads as follows: "Therefore be it resolved, that continued and intensified efforts be made by the Federal Government to provide direct designated support to education in library and information sciences, and this support be in forms which will encourage recruitment and instructional improvement, research, and demonstration."

MR. REGGIE: Do you want to consider that resolution? As many of you as are in favor of considering the resolution, vote yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, vote no.

(Chorus of nays.)

I didn't hear two-thirds; therefore, we are going to hold that we did not reach the two-thirds. Would someone read 24, because I don't have it.

A PARTICIPANT: It's a resolution for funding for elementary and secondary education under ESEA.

A PARTICIPANT: "Be it resolved, that the participants in the White House Conference on Library and Information Services communicate to the President and the Congress of the United States their support for the full funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV B program to at least the level of the fiscal year 1979-1980 budget; and

"Be it further resolved, that these funds be designated for the exclusive purchase of library materials (print and audiovisual materials) and equipment for use within the instructional program in America's public and nonpublic schools."

MR. REGGIE: I think representatives of our Resolutions Committee who wrote the funding one last night can say that that is covered in the funding resolutions already and is redundant. Would anybody like to speak to that?

A PARTICIPANT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have not been authorized to withdraw this resolution; and since the plight of school libraries is so desperate, I feel obliged to get the sense of the meeting in support of this resolution.

MR. REGGIE: I think the meeting has adopted it.

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, John Rice from Louisiana. I am a chairman of a Title IV advisory council in Louisiana. Right now, we are losing better than half of the money that is going to serve our school libraries. I want to beg you to consider it.

MR. REGGIE: Okay. I got your message. The Resolutions Committee says that it is redundant. We heard from the proponents, who would like to have us consider it.

Please put your machines on abstain. As many of you as are in favor of taking that matter up for consideration, signify by voting A; those opposed to considering it, vote B; and those abstaining, vote C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

240, yes; 168, no; and six abstentions. It does not carry. Two-thirds have not been reached. Number 25 is a resolution to encourage the elimination of duplication in the provision of libraries and information services.

MS. McKAY: Mr. Chairman, I'm Nancy McKay, lay delegate from Oregon. What I would like to say is that this resolution is included in your paper ballots under Theme III. However, I asked the Resolutions Committee what the difference was between your affirmation of a paper ballot and your affirmation of a ballot that was brought to you by petitions, and I was told that something that could be passed here on the floor would carry more weight than affirming it by the paper ballot. I would like you to know that before you vote whether to consider it. Correct me if I'm wrong.

MS. LONDON: If it's brought to the floor, you would have it to discuss, and would have to have more weight to get it passed. I have no idea what the difference is.

MS. McKAY: I'm sorry. I misunderstood you then.

MR. REGGIE: You still don't want to withdraw it?

MS. McKAY: No, I do not wish to withdraw it, then.

MR. REGGIE: There is no resolution clause. You see it there before you in its present form. It will require, if it passes, to be properly drawn, but you do see a sense of it. The Chair will refrain from reading it unless so requested. Are you ready to vote on consideration? As many of you as are in favor of considering this resolution number 25, signify by saying yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it, and we will not consider it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, please.

MR. REGGIE: Yes, sir, Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: I would like to rule that we reconsider the consideration of resolution number 10. It was voted not to consider, but I would like to move that we reconsider based on two parliamentary points: 1) that the Committee inaccurately stated that the clauses contained in that resolution were contained in other resolutions already passed by this body; and 2) that there was not a quorum at the time of the vote to not reconsider that motion.

MR. REGGIE: Would you give me a little cooperation on this subject? Let us finish what we have, before we go back and plow over. Would you mind doing that?

MR. SULLIVAN: On the understanding that this motion that I am now making will be reconsidered by you, sir, I will do that.

MR. REGGIE: Sure. Let us get through, and I promise you we will come back to you; but let us get through with the agenda.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you for your cooperation.

Number 26, "Local Control": "Resolved, that there be included in the national information policy elements to ensure continued local control of community libraries and information service." As many of you as are in favor of considering that resolution, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those who are opposed to its consideration, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it, and we bypass number 26. We now go to number 27: "Be it resolved, that the Federal Government fund a study to develop and validate personnel selection procedure to ensure that the most capable personnel are selected and that equal employment opportunity is provided for all."

Are you ready to vote on considering that matter? As many of you who are in favor of considering number 27, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it. Two-thirds were not reached. We move now to number 28: "Be it resolved, we the delegates of the Conference, acknowledge and congratulate Mr. Trezza for his contributions to this Conference, to the National Commission, and to the development of libraries and information services throughout the United States."

(Applause.)

All in favor of considering resolution number 28, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

There being none in the negative, it's considered.

A PARTICIPANT: Call the question.

MR. REGGIE: I think the question is called. We voted to consider 28, but it's now for your approval. All in favor of resolution number 28, commending and congratulating Mr. Trezza, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And there being none in the negative, show that it passes unanimously.

Number 29: "Be it resolved, that the United States assist the United States Territories in the establishment of bibliographic control mechanisms to ensure the availability of and accessibility to their government documents, literary production, technical, economic, social documentation, etc.; and

"Be it resolved, that the United States provide financial and technical assistance to help develop the necessary information infrastructures to facilitate their participation in national, regional, and international networking; and

"Be it further resolved, that the White House Conference recommend to the President of the United States to focus on the United States Territories to accelerate the better utilization of their present resources, and that avenues be sought to build new information resources as needed."

Are you prepared now to vote on considering it? As many of you as are in favor of considering this resolution as presented, signify by saying yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed, no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Then it is considered. Are you ready for the question? As many of you as are in favor of number 29 as submitted, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed, say no.

(No response.)

Show that it passes. Number 30 is a resolution on pricing of basic government documents: "Therefore be it resolved, that the United States Congress continue to foster broad public participation in the Federal Government by substantial subsidies on the sale of basic Federal documents."

All in favor of considering it, vote yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed, vote no.

(Chorus of nays.)

All right, we will consider it. Are you ready to vote on the question?

MR. WELDON: Mr. Chairman, Edward Weldon, delegate-at-large. I would like to amend the very last "Resolved" by deleting the period and adding the phrase, "and continue to maintain a system of regional and local depositories for government information."

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: Do you want to offer that as a friendly amendment?

MR. WELDON: Yes, sir.

MR. REGGIE: Do you accept it? Is there any objection to accepting that as a friendly amendment?

(No response.)

Then it is so ordered. Are you ready to vote for it? All in favor of the resolution as amended by that friendly amendment, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(No response.)

It passes. We move quickly to number 31 which has a little kind of unique drafting. There is no resolution clause, but if we do adopt it we will have to get it in form. If you adopt it, it will be implicit in the adoption that its format will be corrected: "It is therefore resolved, that there be a proposed constitutional amendment to provide" for those top seven. It covers everything on that page. I need your permission, however, to consider it.

Are you ready to vote on whether you want to consider it? As many of you as are in favor of considering number 31 as presented, signify by saying yes.

A PARTICIPANT: Aye.

MR. REGGIE: And those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

It does not pass. Number 32: "Be it resolved that Federal legislation include a title for library planning and development to provide matching funds from State library agency planning and evaluation, studies and research, coordination with all federal library grant programs, planning for a state network development and coordination with multistate and/or national networks, continuing education and staff development, and administration of Federal grants."

I think that's redundant but I leave it up to you. I ask your vote now for consideration. I need two-thirds. All in favor of considering 32 as presented, signify by saying yes.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The nos have it, and it does not pass.

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, I will repeat, if I may, my motion regarding the resolution which is entitled number 10—and I have been asked by those who are supporting resolutions number eight and number 24 to include their cause with mine. Number 10 was voted not to be considered by this body under two erroneous criteria: 1) I believe the Resolutions Committee had confused the body by saying that the material in that resolution was already contained in other resolutions. It is contained in "Whereas" clauses to other resolutions, but it is not contained in the operative clause of any resolution at all; and 2) At the time that this body voted not to reconsider numbers eight, 10, or 24, there was not a quorum in this hall; therefore, this body had no right not to consider it, and those petitions are therefore still live petitions.

MR. REGGIE: I'm trying to get a clarification from my parliamentarian. If you will give me just about one minute, I'll have it.

Mr. Sullivan, the parliamentarians tell me that if indeed you are making a motion to reconsider number 10, as I gather you are—

MR. SULLIVAN: And on behalf of other people, some others, yes.

MR. REGGIE: If you are, a simple majority of this body can consider it. But it will take two-thirds to pass it. Do we understand those ground rules?

MR. SULLIVAN: I understand. May I have 15 seconds to explain the one I'm interested in, which is number 10? We have not as a group expressed the desire that free public libraries are a good thing; and this doesn't mean you can't charge for Xerox machines. Are free public libraries a good thing or not? This body has not said that yet. Now, as a State legislator, I'm going to tell you something. If you start charging fees for libraries, don't bother coming to the State capital, because that's the end of the ballgame. They're just going to say, "Raise your rates, buddy." So I think that this body should at least come out in favor of the notion that is 200 years old in this country of free public libraries.

MR. REGGIE: You've heard the motion to reconsider number 10. Are you ready to vote on the motion to reconsider? I need only a simple majority.

All machines now should be on abstain. If you favor the reconsideration, not the merits, but bringing it back up, vote yes, A; if you do not, vote B; and if you want to abstain, vote C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

243, yes; 107, no; 5 abstentions; therefore, Mr. Sullivan's motion passes. We are back where we started on 10. I need a two-thirds vote to consider it, since it is one of those resolutions by initiative.

You should go back to abstain first. Now, if you vote yes to give me the two-thirds vote, vote A; if you vote no and don't want to give the two-thirds vote, vote B; and if you abstain, vote C. But when we show the votes, if we don't have two-thirds on A, we are not going to take the matter up any more.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

249, yes; 94, no; and 19 abstentions. It passes. If you are ready to move for the adoption of number 10, the Chair will entertain a motion for the previous question.

MR. SULLIVAN: Call the question.

MR. REGGIE: The question has been called. A simple majority will adopt number 10. All in favor of adopting number 10, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And those opposed?

(Chorus of nays.)

I rule the ayes have it.

MS. ROUSE: Charlie Lou Rouse from Oklahoma. It is my understanding that the Resolutions Committee brought two resolutions together under the topic "Coordination of School and Public Library Service." It has been stated previously before this body that an error was made by the Resolutions Committee in bringing together issues five and eight under Theme II.

I request that this error be rectified. No changes in the text are requested, but it will be necessary for editorial changes to be made to separate the intent of number five and number eight. It is requested that this matter be referred to the editorial committee. If this requires a new resolution, I request that authorization by this body be given now. I so move.

MR. REGGIE: You have heard the motion. Is there a second?

A PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. REGGIE: Are you ready to vote on the motion? Let's open your voting machines. Put them all on abstention. If you favor the resolution, please click to A; if you are opposed to the resolution, click to B; if you abstain, C.

(Whereupon, the delegates voted.)

140 affirmative; 159 negative. The motion fails.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, on the same basis as considered for the state of New York in number 10, the delegation from California earnestly requests consideration for numbers eight and 10 "Service to Ethnic Communities."

MR. REGGIE: No, not 10. We just passed that.

THE PARTICIPANT: I meant eight and 16. Eight deals with legislation to fill the need of ethnic groups in library services. Our delegation, with its three Asian Americans, its nine Black Americans, its seven Hispanic Americans, its two Native Americans, and the delegation as a whole, earnestly requests this Conference to consider those two resolutions. I so move.

MR. REGGIE: It takes a simple majority for his motion, and then I will need two-thirds to consider it.

A PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to resolution eight also, please.

A PARTICIPANT: I want to ask a question. In order to have a vote for reconsideration, don't you have to have a person who voted on the prevailing side request it? It sounds like these are partisan people asking for the reconsideration.

MR. REGGIE: I think you are correct. The parliamentarian agrees with you. We need a person from a prevailing side. The gentleman from California, were you on a prevailing side?

THE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. REGGIE: On his honor, he said he was. I need a majority vote. Let's open the voting machines. Please put your voting machines on abstain. If you want to bring eight up for reconsideration, vote A; and if you do not want it, vote B; and if you want to abstain, vote C.

(Whereupon the delegates voted.)

140 affirmative; 155 negative; 48 abstentions. The motion fails.

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, John Rice. I have two proposals to offer, sir. The first would be a motion to the delegates to commend the Chairman for the job that he has done; and the second would be to adjourn the session. I move the first of those motions, sir.

MR. REGGIE: I thank you very much. You have been a great group.

MS. BEAMAN: Point of order.

MR. REGGIE: Yes, ma'am?

MS. BEAMAN: Dorothy Beaman, Maryland. I would like the Conference to thank the alternates, many of whom made paid their own expenses to come here, and who have been a great service to this Conference.

MR. REGGIE: Thank you very much.

THE PARTICIPANT: I would like to propose that we add motions eight and 16, that we were so close on, to the paper ballot.

MR. REGGIE: We don't have the facility to do it. I will rule you out of order.

THE PARTICIPANT: We can write them in.

MR. REGGIE: I am going to rule you out of order.

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, when you recognized me before, I indicated to you that I had two motions to put before the house.

MR. REGGIE: There is a motion to adjourn before the house.

MS. SULLIVAN: Point of order.

MR. REGGIE: All right, there is a point of order.

MS. SULLIVAN: Peggy Sullivan, delegate from Illinois. Mr. Sullivan's earlier motion included resolution number 24, which was earlier considered but has not been reconsidered. At that time, I think several of us had difficulty discussing it without referring to the substance. This was concerning school library assistance. It is essential that this be reconsidered and voted. It can be voted by a rising vote as people leave, if you wish.

MR. REGGIE: I'm sorry, but I'm going to rule that the motion to adjourn now—

MS. CASTRO: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak.

MS. SULLIVAN: You are dropping part of this motion if you do so.

MR. REGGIE: I guess I've done it. I'm ready to adjourn, ma'am.

MS. CASTRO: I am Margaret Castro from the State of California. I'm very proud to be born in this country, and I feel as though at this Conference I and every ethnic minority have been used as a token here, because you eliminated our services. That's right, and you guys better think about what you've done. On that line item number eight, you guys better all think about what you've done to the other part of the people that you guys ignored.

MR. REGGIE: The motion now is to adjourn. All in favor of adjourning, signify by saying.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Those opposed, say no.

(Chorus of nays.)

Let me say a personal word here. You've all been great. We all can't have everything that we wanted. If I've stepped on anybody, I apologize for it. I want you to know you've been a great group. I thank you very, very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

November 19, 1979: Closing Session

Remarks of Charles Benton

My friends, Let me congratulate you. We met a once-in-a-lifetime challenge, and you performed nobly.

Talk about lifelong learning! The past five days have been a continuing education, a mind-stretching experience, invigorating, inspiring, even galvanizing. We heard from a number of people whose books grace our libraries, whose leadership in Congress has supported our goal, and whose messages have expanded our vision. We have met with each other; we have talked together, debated, and learned from each other. It has been an intense experience in the democratic process for all of us. And we have learned that there are no simple answers.

It has taken more than 20 years and four Presidential administrations to pull this White House Conference together. First there was Channing Bete, a man with an idea. The idea grew into reality gradually. Under President Johnson, a National Advisory Committee on Libraries was appointed. Under President Nixon, a permanent and independent planning agency, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) was established. President Ford signed the authorization and request to call the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. President Carter signed the appropriations bill which provided the funding for this Conference. And, at last, after a long series of 57 pre-Conferences in the States and Territories, we have had our five days in Washington.

As you well know, an event like this is the result of hard work on the part of many, many people. We have estimated that 100,000 people have been directly involved. I would like to mention the dedicated efforts of NCLIS and its staff—Al Trezza, Doug Price, Ruby Robinson, Ruth Tighe—and I want to give a special recognition to Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar, who served as the official liaison between NCLIS and the White House Conference.

Our profound gratitude goes to the White House Conference Advisory Committee and the Information Community Advisory Committee. Of course, many other groups, associations, and individuals too numerous to mention have helped to plan this effort, and we thank them all.

And now we want to give special recognition to the White House Conference staff and its Director, Marilyn Gell. Marilyn Killebrew Gell assumed her position on February 1, 1979. In the space of a few short months, she raised more money to support the Conference than any other White House Conference director in history; directed the smallest staff on the most complicated issues of any White House Conference; and performed a herculean job with grace, style, and dignity. Your strong and imaginative leadership has been absolutely essential to the success of the Conference, Marilyn, and you have our unending thanks.

I would also like to recognize the magnificent efforts of the entire staff, but especially senior staff: Jerry Manolatos, Deputy Director, who performed the exhaustive and exhausting tasks of coordinating all the logistics for the Conference, its planning and operation; Dick Akeroyd, coordinator of the Information Center, films, and videotaping of the Conference; Vera Hirschberg, coordinator of the entire public affairs and press operation, public outreach program, major speakers, and special events; Heather Nicoll, who was responsible for all staff computerized operations, the computerized examination of State resolutions, and for the coordination, editing, and production of all delegate preparation materials; Kathleen Smith, who was responsible for international activities, including receptions, for credentials, and for staff support for Advisory Committee selection of at-large delegates; Jean-Anne South, who was responsible for the entire program coordination for the Conference, including speakers, moderators, facilitators, volunteers, and voting on resolutions; and we also thank Peggy McLaughlin, editor of the daily conference newspaper, Ross Heller, its publisher, and Linda Lang, volunteer coordinator.

Thanks also goes to the special staff consultants: Charles Culhane, editor of the program book; Jack Duncan, legislative consultant; Barry Jagoda, coordinator of the Information Community Advisory Committee; Tom Lennox, editor of delegate preparation material; Wendy Martin, chief of staff of Kappa Systems; Bob Rector, for his work at the Information Center and general trouble-shooting; Sue Roschwalb of Ruder and Finn, for her work with the media; Chad Wyatt, our photographer; and Russ Mead, fundraiser with Lawson Associates.

Time does not permit me to name the support staff, the many volunteers from all over the country, and all of our indispensable assistants, without whom this White House Conference could never have occurred. I'd like, once again, to call attention to the marvelous work of our sign language translators, who have helped the hearing-impaired delegates.

We were called to Washington to take a fresh look at our library and information needs in light of the knowledge explosion and the new technologies created to deal with it. We have, indeed, defined those needs. Your votes show that among the top priorities are:

-- an Office of Library and Information Services within the new Department of Education, with an Assistant Secretary of Education at its head;

-- a national information policy to ensure that government agencies at all levels work together to make available all new and existing library and information services to the maximum extent possible;

-- State, local, and Federal governments to work together to identify the functionally illiterate, coordinate programs to train them, and that State and Federal governments should share the costs of these programs;

-- libraries to reach out to special groups of the population—children, youth, the aged, homebound, racial and ethnic minorities, physically handicapped, and emotionally disturbed—and eliminate barriers that now separate them from library and information services; and

-- a new Federal program to provide for international training and exchange of library and information personnel, and the free flow of library materials of all kinds across national borders.

Of course, this Conference is a culminating event, but it is also a new beginning. Let us consider together what happens next.

In December, the Conference Advisory Committee and NCLIS will both meet to discuss the structure of the final report of the Conference. This report, based on your resolutions, is due on the President's desk 120 days from today; and 90 days from that date, the President will make his own recommendations to Congress. Just as NCLIS' activities in the early 1970's became the basis of its national program, this report will be the foundation of its program for the 1980's and beyond. But as Senator Javits told us Thursday night, the Conference should be the staging area for the big campaign—the follow-up for improved library and information services by all of us.

Clearly, your job is not over—it is just beginning. You have taken part in a historic first White House Conference on Library and Information Services. The cycle now repeats. What began as Channing Bete's idea became a historical national forum in Washington; now its results will be carried by each and every one of you back to the grass roots. The final history of the Conference is still being written. A momentum is gathering. You have proven your dedication these past few days, especially the 34 delegates who served as group leaders, and the Resolutions Committee, who worked through the night when it was necessary. They exemplify the spirit and commitment of all the participants.

Our President has stressed that when controversial issues can be examined from many points of view, "a nation or a government or a President is much more likely, ultimately, to avoid mistakes and to make the right decision to preserve our own Nation's security or well-being, and also peace throughout the world."

I am convinced that we have contributed to that process here in Washington these past five days. As we set out to attack the enormous tasks ahead of us, let us draw courage, strength, and wisdom from each other. Good luck, and thank you all.

The first White House Conference on Library and Information Services is now adjourned.

The White House
Conference on Library and
Information Services, 1979

Open Hearings

Open Hearing I

Panel Members

- Bessie Boehm Moore, Chairperson
- Marian P. Leith
- Philip A. Sprague
- Mildred E. Younger
- Carlos A. Cuadra

Testimony By:

Friday, November 16, 1979

	PAGE
Robert E. Goodenow	321
Henriette Avram	324
Frank M. Graves	326
Marion Weiss	329
William R. Prince	331
Stuart Carothers	333
Rev. Roger Pickering	336
Nancy C. Jacobson	338
Joyce Post	341
Richard Gross	343
Helmut Alpers	346
Margaret Goggin	349
Robert Fox	351
Alex Allain	352
Herbert Landau	354
Cecily Cocco	355
Caroline Grills	357
Stanley Huffman, Jr.	358
Sandy Dolnick	359
Cheryl Metoyer-Duran	360

312

Proceedings

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: The hearing will please come to order.

Ladies and Gentlemen: This hearing has been set up by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the White House Conference, which has responsibility for planning these hearings, in order to ensure that people have an opportunity to enter into the record of the Conference anything that they would like to say.

Obviously, there have been more people asked to testify than there is time. I will call the people in order. If that person is not here, then we will proceed to the next person and go back and pick up someone who happens to be late. In order that a maximum number of speakers can be heard, oral testimony will be limited to five minutes, and in many instances we hope it would be less than five minutes and they will be able to summarize their testimony and then leave us the entire testimony for the record.

I would like to call attention to those who are going to testify that this timer has been set up here in front at green when the person starts to testify. It will turn yellow as a warning at the end of four minutes, and one minute later the red will come on to signal that your time has expired. Everyone will be held to the five minutes maximum.

Panelists, if they wish, will then have a maximum of five minutes to address questions to the witness. The witnesses should also be told that their order of appearance has been changed somewhat to fit the schedule, but we hope this will not cause any inconvenience for anyone. As I said at the beginning, the allotted time that we have for this hearing has been spoken for, leaving no additional time for the witnesses; however, it is possible that we may finish ahead of schedule if each person will show consideration, and in that case, additional people who have registered will be able to testify. If any witness fails to appear, these slots will be utilized in the same way.

Those of you who had wished to testify before this hearing and weren't able to do so are encouraged to submit written statements for the record. Your statement, whether you speak it or not, will be entered into the record of the White House Conference, and will have bearing and will be considered with the results of the Conference when the recommendations of the Conference are made to the President. The record will remain open until December 3, so if you are here and you have not yet written a statement or if there is something that is said here today that you wish to refute or that you differ with, you have until December 3 to get your statement in for the record. Any testimony received before December 3 will be included in the record.

Now, may I introduce the panelists here who are all members of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

On my left is Carlos Cuadra; on my right are Philip Sprague and Marian Leith; all are members of the National Commission.

I would like to say to you that I may not be good at conducting this hearing, but I have had more experience than anybody in the United States doing it. I conducted hearings for the Johnson Advisory Commission way back in the 1960's, and then throughout the country for the new Commission when it held hearings across the United States. For the latter part of the hearings, Mr. Sprague and Ms. Leith, since they are newer members of the Commission, will probably have fresher and more interesting questions than we will have.

I wish we had more time for more adequate introduction of the people so that we might let you know that they truly are knowledgeable and experienced witnesses, but unfortunately the time will not allow it, so we will only give just a title.

Our first witness is Robert E. Goodenow, who represents Advanced Communications Institute of America, and he is going to talk on the Microtechnological Revolution.

Statement of Robert E. Goodenow

MR. GOODENOW: Thank you, Madame Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen: I urge this Conference and this committee to recognize the inevitability of the Microtechnological Revolution. The Industrial Revolution is phasing out very quickly. The Microtechnological Revolution is succeeding it and is coming upon us at an extremely fast pace.

The forces behind the Microtechnological Revolution include the Apollo Project, the Vietnam War, marketing, and certainly the desire to collect and retrieve information in an efficient and reliable fashion. Electronic mail is in the business world with the power of management work stations to access multiple data banks with multiple or many different protocols.

The Industrial Revolution has been succeeded by communications that can permit libraries to manage their information and staffs in more efficient ways. Advanced technology permits each datum to be more accessible and controllable by people.

The computer is more reliable than people and, yes, this does permit information to be more accessible and controllable. As certain books and paper go away, as we witnessed here this morning, the new computer pico-second that is displacing today's nano-second, and other developments, will cause integrated data bases to be the backbone of the Microtechnological Revolution. The library will be one segment of this infrastructure.

Libraries and society must monitor the timeliness of each technological development. This includes the hardware, firmware (i.e. powerful, pre-programmed hardware customized by the user), and systems design, so that: 1) there is a need to know, or the need to know can be evaluated for appropriate access; 2) the impact on labor distribution, the skill base, and curricula can be understood and projected. Note the curricula. We have not learned our lesson with the teacher and how the educational institutions were not able to guide, or assist in guiding, the appropriate skills or curricula for what skills would be required; 3) the recognition of industry and information opportunities that will permit society to grow; and 4) we must monitor the timeliness of those negative impacts—I call it the technology unemployment.

What happens when we do not have a need for the automobile engine? What happens to the need of all those laborers? Or what happens when the inevitability of electronic mail goes into the home where the home will have access to the library? What happens to all those 600,000 plus postal workers?

I propose that a blue ribbon feasibility panel of library, industry, and technology experts be assembled to determine if first a commission and then possibly, if a government or a quasi-public agency or other should be formed to comprehend and communicate to the public where and how the infrastructure is going and when. Again, the timeliness of the impacts is very crucial.

This blue ribbon feasibility panel will be chartered and certainly, again, this would be part of this feasibility study, would outline what that charter would be, the funding, the representation, and the selection criteria for such a body. It would be assembled to determine the applicability of an information science index, which will provide a tracking mechanism or data base for: 1) the demand of commercial and institutional skill requirements; 2) the curricula needs to meet all of the above; 3) capturing and synthesizing hardware, firmware, and software—incidentally, software is going away—with related functional labor displacements. The blue-collar worker has decreased proportionally in demand because automation has displaced his labor units since the 1960's and early 1970's. Today, we have office automation for the white collar worker and similar mechanization will have very positive impact on library operations. Yes, this mechanism for data bases will assist in the determination of positive technological impacts on creating new and changing institutions and industries; and 4) the timing of the advanced technological displacement for current industries, products, and people.

This index will provide accurate data to develop the timely educational library and industrial apparatus to support the needs of our future information society.

I thank you very much for this opportunity. Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: We have a question, I believe, from Mr. Sprague.

MR. SPRAGUE: Mr. Goodenow, my impression is, we have had lots of blue ribbon committees in this country, and they haven't served us too well for one reason or another. Who do you think should appoint a blue ribbon committee? Who should select its members? How do you feel that it should enable the public to comprehend what you just told us about? And how would it communicate to the public the import of what you just told us?

MR. GOODENOW: I believe that the answer to these questions would come out of a feasibility panel. There have been many feasibility studies, I grant you. Congress or the Executive Branch should appoint such a body. On the other hand, I believe that, yes, we may have some Senators who are familiar with the technology or certainly are concerned with where it is going. This morning I met with former Governor Schafer of Pennsylvania, who is very concerned with this matter and who may be meeting with either Senator Glenn, or Senator Cohen of Maine, very dynamic individuals.

Yes, how do we put together the feasibility study? I am suggesting that you people take initiative through your—

MR. SPRAGUE: That is, the Commission?

MR. GOODENOW: That is correct—through the liaison you may have with Congress, or the White House, to receive adequate funds to use by a group of people who are from industry, the technologies, the libraries, the educational institutions—you name it—to come back with the necessary criteria to monitor this inevitable impact. Is it a public agency or body? What kind of control? We don't want an FCC. But I promise you that unless something is done today, we are going to have a negative impact or we are going to miss certain significant opportunities.

MR. CUADRA: The kinds of things you mentioned that we ought to keep track of are regularly thought about and, in a sense, kept track of and discussed in professional publications, trade magazines, information industry meetings, etc. My question is: What is it that is not happening? What is it that is not being done that requires setting up still another institution to do it?

MR. GOODENOW: You are right. We have some excellent reporting on these developments. However, I feel strongly that that kind of reporting, the kind of information and, in particular, the sources of information in supporting this concern, are disjointed. There is no organized approach to guiding educational institutions on what curricula they should be offering today, what curricula they should be offering in 1990 or 1995 for an appropriate skill base.

Do we have to have the disjointed development of systems or networks for funding of specialized protocols when today, on the latter point, where micro-processors and micro-circuitry are going, specialized protocols are not needed? Universal protocols are here, and if we don't recognize that, the IBMs and the AT&Ts are going to take advantage of the disjointed approach of systems development in the library field. There is a lot of overlapping taking place, and I'm saying no organization or coordination exists of these kinds of information collection to prevent redundant and costly development with what may contribute to obsolete skill bases.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. Ms. Leith.

MS. LEITH: My question is very much related to Dr. Cuadra's. Over the years, many studies have been done and many attempts have been made to influence the changing curricula. Do you have any suggested ways of doing something differently? Educational institutions are slow to respond, for one thing, and I believe a great many people are trying to influence them to respond in different ways. Certainly a blue ribbon committee doing a feasibility study would have very little impact on determining curricula.

MR. GOODENOW: Thank you for the question. I don't feel that a feasibility group itself would be able to define how institutions should control or develop curricula. Please be aware that today we do have excellent indications that in the late 1990's our curriculum requirements are going to be vastly different from what they are today.

There is a lot of funding coming from the Federal Government and there may be more. Is it and will it be appropriated in the right direction? Should we have a mechanism that institutions can use to plan so that under-employment will decrease and the welfare rolls will not expand? Is there a way for a body to assist in giving good information on the kinds of skills that are going to be required? Educational institutions don't have the capability.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. I would like to present a panelist, Mildred Younger, who is a member of the Commission from Los Angeles.

Our next witness is Henriette Avram, who will be testifying on the American National Standards Institute Committee Z39. Ms. Avram has long been working with the Commission in this field, and we are delighted to have her here today.

Statement of Henriette Avram

MS. AVRAM: First, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Commission for the present support of the American National Standards Institute Committee Z39, and then express the need for its continued support.

With the proliferation of information systems nationally and internationally, the need for increased information sharing becomes apparent as the worldwide economic situation becomes increasingly difficult. Present technology, and the marriage of the computer with telecommunications, increase the potential for information sharing while, at the same time, increasing the need for standardization. Effective and economic use of the technology and compatibility through standardization become more and more urgent. It can be said that standards are the sine qua non of information systems.

In the United States the principal responsibility for developing and promoting standards for information systems rests with the Z39 Committee, which sets these standards for the Library Information

Science and Publishing Agency. Thus, the Z39 Committee develops standards relevant to information systems. Z39 encourages the use of these standards by the information communities and works to ensure that standards within its scope remain viable, that duplication of work is avoided, and that individual enterprise and initiative are encouraged.

Internationally, Z39 participates in the activities of international standards bodies, such as the International Organization for Standardization. Standards developed by Z39 are submitted to the international body for adoption, and standards established internationally are often adopted nationally. A significant example of this type of acceptance of work done elsewhere is the exchange of data and machinery which forms the basis for compatibility worldwide.

The result of this acceptance of the standards adopted elsewhere has not only improved international information transfer, but resulted in a large savings of resources, time, money, and people. Standards are developed following formal procedures established by the American National Standards Institute. The substantive work is performed by subcommittees of individuals with expertise in particular areas. Once reviewed or completed by concerned bodies and individuals, the proposed standard is submitted to a Board of Standards Review; and if that body approves it, the standard is published.

The time of the individuals making up the subcommittee that develops standards isn't contributed by the individual organizations, but funding is required to bring the subcommittee members together as often as required to complete this work in a timely fashion. Funds are also required for Z39 members to participate in international standardization activities.

Since October, 1978, the National Bureau of Standards has contributed office space and housekeeping details to Z39, which is a considerable contribution. Interim financial support is currently received from the Council on Library Resources, the National Science Foundation, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and OCLC, Inc.

However, three of the four have project-oriented functions and funding policies which have reduced their ability to continue as major supporters. The Z39, to remain an effective standards mechanism and to continue to build programs which are responsible to community needs, must have adequate funding.

Two draft resolutions submitted for consideration are directed to the information communities, public and private. One encourages widespread use of standards. The other recommends support, including financial support. Both are aimed at increasing the probability of successful information sharing for the benefit of all.

I would like to add that Bob Gray, the Executive Director of Z39, is here and has a full statement of my testimony if you or anyone is interested in having it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: I think it might be well for the testimony to be submitted so that it might be included. Now is the time for questions. Mr. Sprague.

MR. SPRAGUE: Having broken my lance in private industry in trying to develop standards in the technology field, I have to ask this question. Given the extraordinary rate at which technology is growing—I think there are three new versions of disc video recorders, unstandardized, as an example—are you optimistic? I sometimes think that in the United States standards are almost anathema to our diversity and to our inventiveness. Are you optimistic about standards?

MS. AVRAM: I am very optimistic. In fact, the standards were undertaken by Z39. I know that if we did not have standards that existed out of information transfer, we would have a terrible imbalance. We could not understand each other. So my answer is yes.

MR. CUADRA: I think I would like to follow up on Mr. Sprague's point, and it has to do with those circumstances under which standards help and those under which they prematurely freeze the technology. I remember five or six years ago when I was running an on-line service, I was being asked: Why don't you all do the same thing and have them all run the same way?

That would have been a terrible disservice at that time, because during the past five years there have been, on the average, one or two system improvements a month from many of these services. And if anyone had tried to freeze the protocol procedures, we would not have the kind of systems we enjoy today.

So, the question is, in the standards work, how do you differentiate between those things that are premature to freeze and those which provide obvious ends, or do you make that distinction?

MS. AVRAM: Yes, I think the point that you brought up is a very important issue. I think, to make this distinction accurately to the best of our ability, it takes individuals with expertise and with experience. I know and recognize the area is not black and white. It is very often grey. But in spite of that, in my involvement in the past 15 years, I believe that the area of standardization is encouraging.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much for your excellent testimony. We are glad to have Bob Gray here, too. Now, our next witness is not identified by title. His name is Frank M. Graves.

Statement of Frank M. Graves

MR. GRAVES: Madam Chairman, I am an economist in Washington, with a long-standing interest in information problems. I am currently doing a benefit/cost study, for example, of the nationwide electronic information system that is being developed by the Federal Judicial Center for the Federal courts. Like other information systems, this one is proving to be expensive to design and install. The existence of many prospective courts as users, however, may in the end justify the expense by their common sharing of the fixed costs. The more users, the less the burden on each.

Thus, in the discussions at this forum, a question that must repeatedly be asked is: How are we going to pay for the needed information-handling improvement? For electronic systems, a partial answer to that question can be found in the phrase "aggregation of the market." Deliberate gathering together of prospective users—aggregation—can, from the beginning, show the way to lower unit costs for each participant. The lower the unit cost is, the more users will be attracted, lowering costs for each still further.

The idea of deliberate aggregation of markets for technological improvements has been espoused by the National Science Foundation for some years. They see it as a suitable Federal policy for assisting the spread of expensive technology that will contribute to improved U.S. productivity. Certainly improvement in the information-handling capability of our library system falls within the scope of this notion.

I have a simple five-point proposal which I think the Commission should spend some time thinking about and carrying out, if it really wants to be practical in finding a way to pay for the electronic system improvements which are so desperately needed as one part of library system strengthening. One need only look at the huge increase in published pages being supplied by the Chemical Abstracts Service, for example, to see the underlying cause: explosion of information supply.

The first point is for the Commission, urged on by this Conference, to secure from vendors of information services and from owners of data bases their price schedules for 200, 500, 1,000, 2,000, 10,000, additional subscribers. Vendors will respond if they be asked: "What would you charge us if we doubled your present subscription list? Trebled it? Quadrupled it?" The quoted prices will go down, because fixed overheads will be shared by more and more users, thus bringing down full unit costs to each; and because the prices charged are usually cost-based. Competition forces this.

The price schedules thus obtained, based on larger numbers of users, should tend then to attract still more users, eventually. The National Commission should circulate these price lists to the libraries.

The second point is for the libraries, meanwhile, to prepare financial plans incorporating the amount of funds they believe could be raised from local taxes and gifts and from a user fee schedule. As a guideline, a national, fairly standardized schedule could be provided as a memo from the National Commission. It would then be reasonable to assume, I maintain, that Congress and the many State legislatures each would be willing to put up 25 percent of the information system annual costs, but only if local effort guaranteed 50 percent.

The third point is that user fees must be zero during the period of promotion and familiarization. Vouchers could be issued to library patrons for some number of free queries, but it would be valuable at some point to introduce user fees to raise revenue. Because people don't know what they want until they see what they can have, it is very important that there be a free period of promotion and familiarization to build educated demand.

A fourth point is for the National Commission to take the lead in preparing presentations for congressional and State legislative committees, setting forth the need for information system funding and the justification based on quoted prices for aggregated markets and affirmed local effort.

For the fifth point, clearly a detailed work program and budget for the above market-aggregating activity would be necessary at the start. The Commission recently has appointed a new task force, the Public-Private Sector Task Force, which would be an excellent group within the Commission to carry this responsibility.

Overall, then, my argument is that a strategy of merely begging for money will not be effective. To get legislative funding, a sound, workable means of lowering costs and of demonstrating substantial local effort are essential.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. Questions?

MR. SPRAGUE: I am just curious when you say it's got to be free during start-up. Who would underwrite the free part of this program?

MR. GRAVES: That has to be a part of the budget of the whole thing, taken into account at the beginning. Some legislative money, some local money would be needed.

MR. CUADRA: Have you asked any substantial number of data base producers of on-line services the question you suggest we ask?

MR. GRAVES: I have not called them, but I know the economics of their industry sufficiently to know that in the case of one firm, for example, it is limited to about 600 subscribers nationally at a unit price of $1,000 per subscription. The vendor thinks that, at that price, he has saturated his market. He has not looked at what he could do with a lowered price.

MR. CUADRA: I think your arithmetic is impeccable, but I have talked with some 217 data base producers and 59 on-line services that exist. And most of them would not respond, I think, to that question, simply because it's a business matter and they don't know the impact of the sales of printed products, say, on increasing volume of on-line services. That doesn't say we shouldn't look into it, but I am curious as to whether you had any ready basis for that information.

MR. GRAVES: Well, let me put it this way: If they do not respond, it would indicate that they have formed, in effect, a kind of cartel. It is not reasonable to think that if they are, in fact, competing with each other, they won't respond. And further, if the existing information firms don't respond, then there is an obvious market opportunity for someone who will.

MS. YOUNGER: Are you not, in effect, asking the Commission to endorse one product at the cost of all the rest?

MR. GRAVES: No, I don't believe I am. What I am saying is that—looking at the huge increase in information output being produced by Chemical Abstracts Service, for example, which over the last 20 years has gone from an index number of one to an index number of 5.24 in total pages published—what I am saying is that there is no human way to keep up with such an information explosion other than by using modern, expensive information technology.

What needs to be done, then, is to lower the fixed costs of that expensive technology by spreading it over many more users than are now available at the currently quoted high prices. That is where market aggregation by the Commission comes in.

MS. YOUNGER: It seems to me that the end product would be tying up tax money at all levels for one product.

MR. GRAVES: No. This kind of thing has to be a part of an overall budget. First, let's get the quotations in from vendors; second, let's see what local effort can do; third, let's budget for all of the spectrum of activities and things we think we need to do. I am morally certain that market aggregation will lower prices, because it would lower costs, without doubt. I am absolutely sure of that. When that happens, it will free up scarce library resources that can be used in other library activities.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much, sir. I work with economists a great deal and I wish that more economists would become interested in helping us sort out the library and information services. Next, we have Dr. Marion Weiss, who will testify on the use of television and film as informational resources.

Statement of Marion Weiss

DR. WEISS: I represent the University Film Association, which is a national organization made up of people like me who teach film production or film studies at the university level. The organization is also made up of film television students at the university level and those who make documentaries and instructional films for institutions of higher learning.

The words "TV" and "film" are familiar words to everyone in this room, especially for me, and probably all of you who watched, when you were growing up, about an average of five hours of television a day. I remember very little about my teen years except the double features I sat through on Saturday afternoon. We all grew up thinking that TV and movies were to be enjoyed, nothing else; to be our electronic babysitters; to act as raw material that we could passively, and without thinking, soak up like sponges.

Today, coincidentally, I am 40 years old, and today I know that film and television are not merely escapist fare; they can be regarded as important means for obtaining information. Television shows like "All in the Family," and even "As the World Turns," can serve as informational sources about American family life and contemporary attitudes or morality and other time-binding concerns like war, justice, and love.

Films like the recent "10," "Starting Over," and "Rich Kids" can likewise communicate information about marriage and the mid-life crisis. Classic films like Renoir's "Grand Illusion" and "Citizen Kane" can give you glimpses into the tyranny of war and peace, respectively.

So far, I have been talking about commercially produced and consumed examples of information dissemination. There exists another type of television and film which lies outside the commercial industry, and that's the non-theatrical field. Since World War II, the non-theatrical area has developed into a fragmented network of libraries, universities, schools, museums, and clubs that exhibit documentaries, educational films, promotional films, industrials, foreign films, avant-garde films, and social statement films; and their subjects range from art to zoos, from aging to Zen.

Educational films and television programs, in particular, form a large part of the non-theatrical field. I know there is no elementary school or junior high school or high school in this country that doesn't use film or television in an important way as part of its instructional curriculum. The successful informational film or television shows are essential parts of the learning experience. The good ones have a logical beginning, middle, and end, are stimulating, have vocabulary geared to a specific audience, and are often allied to a text and accompanied by a teacher's guide or manual.

Now, the avant-garde and television shows also form an important part of the non-theatrical field, but people often don't want to deal with these works. They are thought of as "art for art's sake." I want to suggest that they can offer unique points of view about the world and document a specific subject the commercial industry fails to treat at all.

For example, during World War II, the commercial films tended to be comedy and war films, but there was an avant-garde film, Maya Deren's "Meshes of the Afternoon," which gave a different but realistic view of the same period where individuals were troubled with sexual and identity crises. A more recent avant-garde film, Stan Brakhage's personal documentary on the birth of his first child, has been thought of by doctors as being the best film on natural childbirth, for instance. Bruce Conner's film, "Report," is probably the most remarkable recreation of the national mood immediately following President Kennedy's assassination.

Hopefully, our children no longer will see the electronic media as simply a means of escape or entertainment. Hopefully, they will come to know television and film, as I have, as two of the most exciting, stimulating, and visual ways in which to know the world.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. Any questions?

MR. SPRAGUE: What would you have us to do?

DR. WEISS: I would have you particularly make people aware that they can get some of these films through their local library free of charge, and that they are terrific. They are just wonderful and I think every library does have access in the budget to get films.

Also, our local television shows, our commercial television shows, can be wonderful sources of learning, as I am sure we all know. "All in the Family" can be taught from the standpoint of language, of non-verbal behavior, of how to tell where a person is coming from by just the arrangement of his furniture in his living room. There are a lot of things there. Even for "Three's Company" or "Mork and Mindy," we should look beyond just the obvious surface reality, look beyond the obvious entertainment commodity, and a little more into the learning capability of these commercial shows and films.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you for coming. Our next witness is William R. Prince, and he is to testify on the subject "Serving Blind People through the Public Library."

Statement of William R. Prince

MR. PRINCE: My name is Bill Prince. I am a delegate from Los Alamos, New Mexico; and, for the record, I am blind. The subject of my presentation this afternoon is, "Access to Nonrecreational Printed Material," what I shall refer to as time-dependent material.

The Library of Congress and its National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS) administer a talking book program for the blind and handicapped. This program is one of the longest continuous programs serving the blind. It was initiated almost a half-century ago, in 1931. The public law has been amended several times. The NLS administers the talking book program through its regional library system and its sub-regional libraries. The program provides books and periodicals to the blind and handicapped mainly through recordings. The material is provided in either hard records, flexible discs, or in tape cassettes, and the program also provides the playback equipment. The blind and the handicapped have free access to the talking book program. As you can tell, I am a strong advocate of the talking book program; however, it limits its material primarily to recreational reading.

What I am asking access to is nonrecreational reading or, as they say, the time-dependent material. This Conference which we are all attending is a typical example, if not an exceptional example, of the amount of printed material which all of us have received prior to this meeting. As a blind person, and I imagine the other handicapped people, we have had very little access to the material.

As you know, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science mentioned, in one of the pre-Conference program papers, that all persons had the right to read. Further, the Commission acknowledged that the Federal Government has the responsibility to make this possible. The Commission also indicated that it estimates there are some six million blind and handicapped people who are non-users of our libraries. I, in some small way, would like to reduce this number.

What I would like to suggest is that small pre-fabricated tape-recording booths be made available for our regional libraries, and also for some strategically located local public libraries. The administration of the purchase of these booths, which, by the way, are currently available for only a few thousand dollars, should be, I would think, through the NLS. The reason I am mentioning this is that I feel strongly that we need to have uniformity in the type of booth that would be purchased, and also to ensure compatibility of the produced tapes with the existing hundreds of thousands of playback machines now in use throughout the country.

I could recommend, if I may, two ways that we could implement this program. First, we could ask Congress to amend the present public law, which mandates the talking book program, so as to make Federal funds available. Another way would be to use our State libraries to request funds through Title IV-B of the Library Services and Construction Act. As all of you know, this Act was amended in 1966. In the amended act, the libraries were asked to improve their services to the blind and physically handicapped.

In closing, I would just like to state that I am sure you will agree with me that an informed person, be that person handicapped or not, is a participating person, and independent access to printed material would go a long way toward restoring freedom of choice to the blind and physically handicapped. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: We thank you so much. Now we have a question from Ms. Leith from the State library in North Carolina.

MS. LEITH: Mr. Prince, my comments are more in the form of comments than questions. I am a little dismayed by your presentation, because I really believe that almost everything that you have suggested be done is being done. You are very correct; Library Services and Construction Act money is used for the blind and physically handicapped and much of that money goes into public libraries, into regional libraries, to do precisely what you have suggested.

I believe that the standardization, for instance, of your booths would be relatively impossible because of local autonomy. But I also wonder if you don't think the Kurzweil machine is going to take care of most of this. I believe that libraries are beginning to purchase them. I think that this is a more valid outcome or solution to your problem. Do you not feel that way?

MR. PRINCE: You gave me several things to comment on. Number one, I cannot agree with you that our library system is, in any way, giving me as a blind person access to anything other than recreational reading. I do not know of one regional library or one local public library that has a tape recording booth purchased with Federal funds. The NLS has been consulted in setting these up and getting the proper equipment for more than 100 privately funded tape recording booths; but these are, by a large majority, used by volunteers.

All I can say, in response to your comment, is that in order to participate knowledgeably in testifying for legislation and testifying on different committees that I am on, I have had to impose upon secretaries and friends to transcribe printed material onto cassettes. I may say that I don't know whether you are blind or not, but it is double frustration to get a cassette that is unintelligible. I'm not criticizing the people who put it out, but, generally speaking, a volunteer system will not work. Volunteers, due to the nature of the program, cannot provide in a timely fashion the material that I am talking about.

I forgot the last comment that you made. Would you repeat that, please?

MS. LEITH: The Kurzweil machine.

MR. PRINCE: I am very familiar with the Kurzweil and also the telesensory synthetic speech machine; and, yes, I think they are obviously a great technical innovation which would help the blind. But I am sure you are aware of the cost of the machine. I don't know the current cost, but the last I heard it was going over $35,000. It is not accessible to an individual. It would have to be made accessible through institutions and so forth.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much, Mr. Prince. We appreciate your testimony and are glad you are with us. We appreciate your suggestions. Our next witness is Stuart Carothers.

Statement of Stuart Carothers

MR. CAROTHERS: I am the executive director of Recording for the Blind. It's rather a coincidence that Mr. Prince was just before me. I would like to give my prepared comments, and then I would be happy to discuss the relationship between the subject he was discussing and Recording for the Blind. I think it might be interesting.

I welcome the opportunity to appear before an open hearing of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

I have felt a sense of involvement for several weeks, since at our headquarters in New York City we have been putting on tape for blind delegates some of the fascinating material being sent out in preparation for this Conference.

Let me first tell you something about Recording for the Blind, and then describe our new library program. Recording for the Blind (RFB) is a national educational organization meeting a critical need for visually, physically, and perceptually handicapped students and professionals. It is the only national library that provides free on-loan tape-recorded books for educational purposes to thousands of handicapped Americans at every academic level.

Since its founding in 1951, more than 53,000 men, women, and children in every State have used RFB's service, learning by ear to prepare for independent, self-sustaining careers as teachers, social workers, ministers, engineers, mechanics, security analysts, and business people. RFB's library of spoken words, the largest educational resource of this kind in the world, makes possible for them a productive future.

RFB's constantly expanding master tape library contains more than 50,000 titles, more than one million recorded hours on topics as varied as astrophysics, macroeconomics, and art history. With the dedicated assistance of highly trained volunteers working in the 29 RFB recording studios throughout the country, the master tape library is growing at the rate of 400 titles per month. Last year alone, RFB filled, from our headquarters in New York City, requests from more than 13,000 borrowers for nearly 90,000 titles.

The National Endowment for the Humanities recently made a substantial grant to RFB to create a system for subject search of the titles in RFB's master tape library using key and subject words, annotations, and text abstract information. For the first time, blind and print-handicapped students and professionals wishing to do research will have a quick, dependable mechanism for searching the taped material available to them.

Let me explain. While RFB has a strong record of providing educational texts to the Nation's visually handicapped, we have historically been able to answer requests for books only by author and title. As the aspirations of the blind grow, requests for RFB's books grow apace at an average of 10 percent annually, and we increasingly receive inquiries from both students and professional users for material on specific subject areas. Blind and print-handicapped students and professionals are doing more research for courses, theses, and dissertations, and RFB must be able to respond to their requests. Professional users, as well, need this capability.

As a result, RFB plans to catalog all its titles in MARC format with the assistance of the National Library Service for the Blind and Physcially Handicapped of the Library of Congress. Let me add, parenthetically, that the services of RFB and the National Library Service complement each other, NLS concentrating on recreational reading and RFB on educational reading. We will then augment these records to facilitate search. We will put our catalogue in the Bibliographic Retrieval Services, so RFB's bibliography can be searched at any of the system's terminals. We will combine this cataloging system with taped books from other collections.

It is important the blind and print-handicapped students and professionals across the country, as well as librarians and educators, become aware of the capability RFB is developing. We would like to hear from anyone who has suggestions about how we can improve our services.

This morning, President Carter referred to the frequent isolation of the handicapped from library services and the printed word. Title IV of the proposed National Library Act addresses this problem directly by proposing funding of special services for the handicapped.

I cannot leave this hearing without urging that this Conference recommend that the United States Government help defray the operational costs of private libraries like ours, which fill a critical and unique function and have proven track records of serving the visually handicapped in all 50 States. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Mr. Sprague.

MR. SPRAGUE: I'm not sure I understand whether there is a dispute between you and Mr. Prince, but Mr. Prince seemed to indicate that all that was available to him was books for entertainment. You described a lot of things that are not entertainment. Perhaps it hasn't reached Mr. Prince. Secondly, I though I heard him say that the use of volunteers just didn't work. Did I hear you say that you do use volunteers?

MR. CAROTHERS: We do use volunteers. Perhaps what Mr. Prince was focusing on—and you can correct me if I'm wrong—is the fact that he would like to be able to go in the library and find some reference material and have it placed into recorded form on a relatively immediate basis. We provide the tapes from our master tape library in New York, which can mean, as far as time to run the copy and get it out to the individual requesting it, a matter of two or three weeks. If it must be recorded, we assign it to one of our 29 studios, and we may be talking in terms of one, or two, or three months. There is a large gap there, just as Mr. Prince points out. For new material, that is, not in recorded form, that in regard to the service he was suggesting it makes a great deal of sense for some of this material to be recorded on the spot.

MR. SPRAGUE: Would you comment, too, on the technology problem? That is, the variety of tape machines and the suggestion he made about a uniform console or vestibule, or whatever it was. Do you feel that is a problem? Is that the correct solution?

MR. CAROTHERS: For the way we record, we feel we have the best, a more than adequate system. Basically, the difference, as he pointed out, between RFB and the Library of Congress is they do the recreational reading. So their emphasis is quite different from ours, which is education. We want to convey information. We do it so it can be referenced immediately. We are not as concerned about the—I won't say quality—but we are not as concerned about whether it's Alexander Stewart or whether it's a volunteer who can convey it in a very adequate fashion.

MS. LEITH: In the past, RFB has mostly taken care of students. Do I understand from your presentation that this is to be an expanded service of reference for any blind or visually handicapped person?

MR. CAROTHERS: RFB began purely with students. In fact, we started out serving college students, and it has expanded down and up. We now record and send duplicate copies for elementary students, graduate students, and many, many professionals. We have 2,000 to 3,000 professionals, who are in all walks of life and careers, who are using our recording texts on a very regular basis.

MS. YOUNGER: What about the individual who would like to study a particular subject but is not enrolled in any program and hasn't obviously achieved professional status, and perhaps this material is not available to him?

MR. CAROTHERS: We will still provide those texts. When we say "education," it must be something that is either connected with some curricula requirements or, in a very broad sense, is educational in nature. We don't, frankly, split hairs as to whether it's an immediate course requirement. But we do not focus, as does the Library of Congress, on recreational reading such as the best sellers.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. It has been very enlightening. We appreciate you coming. Our next speaker is the Reverend Roger Pickering, who will talk about library services for the deaf.

Statement of the Reverend Roger Pickering

REV. PICKERING (through an interpreter): My name is Reverend Roger Pickering. I am a full-time clergyman serving as minister to the deaf community in the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania. I am speaking this afternoon as the Chairman of the Deafness and Hearing Impairment Council of Southeastern Pennsylvania, and also as a member of the Advisory Committee for Library Services to the Deaf, a free library system of Pennsylvania.

I would like to demonstrate to you the need at the national level for support for, and encouragement of, library services specifically for the hearing-impaired citizen. It is not generally recognized that hearing impairment is the most prevalent serious disability in the United States, occuring, for example, four times more frequently than blindness, to which deafness is often compared. For another statistic, the sign language of the profoundly deaf is the fourth most commonly used language in this country, following after English, Spanish, and Italian.

More importantly, while blindness cuts off a blind person from things, deafness cuts off deaf persons from other people—or, to put it another way, blindness is one of the most visible of all serious disabilities. It is a handicap of mobility, while deafness is most invisible. It is a barrier to communication; and it is precisely the communication of ideas, and information, and knowledge, and culture that is the basis of a library system. Yet, despite the fact that 95 percent of the hearing-impaired and deaf population are taxpayers, self-supporting, self-respecting members of their communities, until just recently the library systems had done absolutely nothing to break through the barriers to provide services to the deaf.

The Free Library is one of the pioneers providing such service, but when I tell you that it has been in force in that area all the way back to 1976, you may begin to understand how very recently it is that our libraries have begun to make any effort to bring equality in services to the deaf community.

In that short span of three years, the Free Library of Philadelphia has discovered an entirely new world of problems and opportunities. I have with me as an attachment to this transcript of my remarks a brief fact sheet that lists several things that have been accomplished in Philadelphia as examples of what can be done and should be done. For example, storytelling hours, interpretative programs for deaf children and adults, preparing and distribution of resource kits, books collections on deafness and sign language, the installation of a telecommunication device that provides, for the first time, accessibility for a person such as me to phone information and reference services which my hearing compatriates have taken for granted for years and years, full participation in community affairs and, in particular, our Deaf Awareness Week.

As I have said, few areas have been pioneering in providing this service, to reach out and seek to make available to their hearing-impaired citizens what has long been available to the hearing. But the deaf people live in every State, in every city, in every rural area or community. It is my plea and the plea of other deaf people, including some delegates here at this Conference, that this White House Conference on Library and Information Services will recognize our special needs and take steps to see that those needs are no longer overlooked. Open to us, if you will, the doors of the libraries throughout the Nation and allow to us the store of information that is as much our right as it is yours.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. Is there a question?

MR. SPRAGUE: Could you be more specific about programs you would advise us to undertake?

REV. PICKERING: Are you speaking about the local example of Philadelphia, or things here at the Conference?

MR. SPRAGUE: Should we use the Philadelphia example nationwide?

REV. PICKERING: It is one example. I don't want to give you the impression that it is the only one. Here in Washington, D.C., they have another example of a program. What I want is some focus on those programs as models for the Nation, yes.

MS. YOUNGER: I certainly appreciate this particular testimony. I spent 17 years without the ability to speak. So I experienced many of the things that the deaf experienced, because the assumption was often made that I was deaf. This has been a very touching kind of testimony to hear and I want you to know that there is at least one Commission member who is extremely sympathetic.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. Our next witness is Nancy C. Jacobson on "Information and Referral Services in the Public Library."

Statement of Nancy C. Jacobson

MS. JACOBSON: I think I need to reiterate a few things that were said already today much more eloquently than I could say them, but I think it will reinforce what has been said.

Information explosion is a most timely topic. We are told it is the fastest growing industry, with megatons of information. Historically, libraries, through librarians, have been major brokers in the organization and dissemination of knowledge. This role must continue in ever more sophisticated ways to bring order out of chaos for individuals in need of information. For the general public, the public library has been a vehicle for bringing about this service, which today is taking on broader connotations. It is often called information and referral.

Adopting this function, which will be vital to each and every person living in the 1980's, would warrant a change in focus from books to information with publicity. This is likely to produce a by-product called money. In the long run these actions might just prove essential to the survival of these same libraries.

Just what is information and referral, I&R for short? There are as many explanations as there are people who discuss it; but essentially I&R is a process of linking an individual with an informational service need to a resource designed to meet that need.

Nearly all libraries already fill the information part. Referral indicates an added feature, better coordinated local community information. It means furnishing the names of people and agencies, to provide assistance to those who need it.

Information might be as simple as facts about new or used cars. Referral might be as complicated as a recent call to our library when a woman asked: "What do I do? My husband just asked me for a divorce." In this case, recommendations might be to the appropriate agencies to cover the emotional aspect, counseling, seminars and support groups, the financial and legal aspects, and/or employment information, such as homemaker re-entry programs.

Obviously, these questions are not in the area of trivia, nor are they school assignments.

The library can be the first point of communication in some rather momentous decisionmaking. One of the strongest features of I&R is that it serves everyone, including the physically handicapped, the minority, the elderly, and the poor. It is important to mention here, too, that most libraries have some form of networking which allows interchanges of information, so that smaller libraries are able to communicate with larger ones and give individual patrons access to a greater scope of resources.

Computers currently have the capability of providing this access. They are not yet, to my knowledge, being utilized in this way, although I did talk with a delegate from Colorado yesterday who said they were doing this very thing. In order to alert the public to the services already offered in libraries, it is necessary to provide massive doses of publicity. The desire for publicity came up in various forms in many of the State conferences. Identifying libraries as information centers can, I believe, bring attention to what libraries are already doing; and this thrust could not only heighten the state of the art, but bring increased revenues, which in turn would assist in further improving the quality of I&R.

All of which leads me to the final part of the triumvirate: money, an essential along with I&R and public relations. One can save money from both ends—as an individual user, as a taxpayer. Whether it is through information gleaned in order to buy that aforementioned used car, or whether it's only an 800 telephone number to call a specific agency, in these days of high inflation and tight pocketbooks, the library can be a real source of personal economy.

Public libraries, in recent years particularly, have found themselves competing vigorously and often futilely for local funds. Everyone knows fire and police protection is essential, as well as garbage pickup and disposal. Information is every bit as important, yet the populace has not yet realized it. If libraries were seen as indispensable, as envisioned by the activities already mentioned, they just might be in a better competitive position for the increasingly scarce dollars available for distribution.

Considering their very limited budgets, libraries are perhaps the best bargain in government. One does not have to be a seer to read the dire message for the future. Without a major injection of energy, I predict that public library service in the quantity and quality we know it today, limited though it may be, will dwindle to an almost worthless state. I can describe this in very simple terms. According to a recent Kiplinger report, the consumer price index is expected to rise from 50 to 75 percent in the next five years. The recommendation to businessmen is that they anticipate at least a 60 percent increase. With Proposition 13 in California and a four percent tax cap in Massachusetts, it is incomprehensible that local units of government will willingly and automatically increase library budgets 12 percent a year, and that would mean breaking even.

In summary, public libraries are indispensable units of government, because everyone needs information—and this includes readers and nonreaders. Therefore, by enhancing the reference service, by publicizing it as information and including some referral aspects, universal public demand would be created. And once the need is recognized, then libraries would no longer be at the bottom of the budget heap, and the increased funding would benefit all other library services as well.

A national campaign publicizing the concept of libraries and information could rejuvenate public libraries and give them the opportunity, through a more equitable share of funding, to continue current programs, improve the information referral aspect, and allow preparation for the future, which so rapidly becomes the present and even more speedily the past. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Is there a question?

MR. CUADRA: You have reminded me of a conference I attended in 1974 at Long Beach on information and referral services. There were about 150 people there and a great deal of excitement. I think only about 10 people in the conference were librarians. I came back to the Commission and tried to convey some of the excitement about this kind of service as a possible extension or maybe even salvation of the public library, and I failed in conveying that.

One of the problems that I recall at the time was that the librarians in 1974 took a rather dim view of some of these services because they bordered on advocacy. They took a dim view of taking someone in a car to the agency that had the information. They took a dim view of following up to see whether the person's information needs had been met.

So, my question to you is: Is the time now different, or do you think that concerns about advocacy or services which border on advocacy are in any way changed? Is there greater readiness to adopt this kind of service?

MS. JACOBSON: I hope so. I'm not sure how far we can go in regard to advocacy, but I must say we haven't made much progress since then. In Massachusetts there was a conference recently on information and referral services, and out of 150 people, three were librarians, which I find quite shocking. I find other organizations are taking over this aspect of service, when here we are sitting on the information. We have so much more than they to offer, because it's right there.

MR. SPRAGUE: But what if the way it will be right there is on my television screen for which, somebody said today in a demonstration, I might pay $15 a month? Now, if a million people in a trade area pay $150 a year—$150 million, have I got that right?—and that were made available to libraries, you wouldn't have a fiscal problem, would you?

MS. JACOBSON: Absolutely not.

MR. SPRAGUE: But something is running right around you. They'll put it on my television screen while you wither and die. Is that correct?

MS. JACOBSON: Well, it could happen. I don't know, I'm probably totally wrong, but I think it will be a while before questions can be asked of a television screen, or computer, or whatever, within each home. I really do feel that with the oil problems and inflation, we aren't going to be quite so free and so able to buy all the hardware and various things that we have been doing in the past. But that's my personal opinion.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Thank you very much. Next we have Joyce Post, who represents the American Society of Indexers in Philadelphia. Philadelphia is well represented here today. A lot of people are talking about it. The former Director of the Philadelphia Free Library was a member of the original Commission, the Johnson Commission, Emerson Greenaway, who has rendered great service to this Nation. We always remember him with deep affection.

Statement of Joyce Post

MS. POST: I welcome this opportunity to present the concerns of my organization. The American Society of Indexers was founded in 1968 to raise the low status of indexes and indexers in publishing, to improve the quality of indexes, and to set standards for professional indexers. The society addresses itself to three issues for consideration at this Conference.

First, users of information and indexes. Delegates drawing up resolutions in the first two theme areas of this Conference, libraries and information services to meet personal needs and libraries and information services to enhance lifelong learning, should be aware that bodies of information for personal day-to-day decisionmaking, such as government files, lists of local interest groups and human service agencies, community information banks, and so forth, will only be turned into dynamic useful tools if they are properly indexed, using terms and schemes relevant to their users.

The American Society of Indexers recommends that delegates affirm the importance of indexes to this type of information, and that provisions for indexing those bodies of information needed for personal needs and lifelong learning be included in the resolutions considering these information needs.

Second, publishers and indexes. Many nonfiction books are published today without indexes. Of those that are indexed, many do not meet minimum index standards. The American Society of Indexers recommends that these situations be corrected immediately in the following two ways: 1) that a dialog be opened between this society and the other publishing groups attending this Conference to explore mutual interests and work out individual differences regarding the presence and quality of indexes in nonfiction books and other printed works; and 2) that delegates pass a resolution affirming both the necessity of having indexes which meet recognized standards in all nonfiction work and the desirability of a publisher/indexer dialogue to implement this need.

Third, libraries and indexes. Dwindling financial resources, coupled with the rise of nonlibrary organizations that provide information searching and consulting services for a fee, have meant that libraries need to reassess their role in the information-rich environment of the next decade. A recognition of the value of indexes and a requirement that they be present in all nonfiction books, resource materials, and information products purchased by libraries, and also that such indexes meet acceptable criteria, will help libraries through this difficult reassessment period.

Delegates voting on resolutions concerning the proposed National Library Act, and/or some type of national level library coordinating agency, should make certain that provisions for ensuring the presence of indexes along the lines set forth in this paper be included in the design of such legislation and/or coordinating agency, possibly by means of a specific policy-making index provision within the larger national agency.

The American Society of Indexers urges this Conference to recommend the following two points when considering library priorities: 1) that individual libraries require that good indexes, relevant to the needs of the intended users, be present in any nonfiction book or information product they purchase; and 2) that any national legislation and/or coordinating agency established to oversee library and information services include a distinct provision for index policy-making.

Up to this point, every idea expressed in this statement has been concerned with conventional information sources, whether they be the older, more traditional printed format or the newer on-line format. We don't have to look too far into the future to see even more exciting changes in information formats and delivery. These changes also will mean changes in indexes as we now know them. New formats for making them available will have to be explored, and the immediacy with which they will have to be prepared will become an increasing concern. The American Society of Indexers expresses its confidence in the information formats of the future and its eagerness to participate in the indexing challenges that will accompany them.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: That is good testimony and we thank you very much. Anybody have a question?

MR. CUADRA: Comment. There are, as you know, a number of experiments under way, primarily in Europe, in information systems for the home. My impression of these is that very few people who understand indexing principles or librarianship or the organization of information have been tapped to consult on some of these projects.

There are at least two experiments going on in the United States at the present time. One is by the GTE Company and the other is by Mike Ridder. I think it would be useful for you to bring the attention of your organization to these kinds of organizations, because they understand very well the computer technology and the telecommunications technology, but not necessarily how to organize, and tag, and label information to communicate with the consumer.

MS. POST: Thank you.

MR. SPRAGUE: I'm not sure I understood you completely, but I thought I heard you say that, for example, the Commission ought to recommend that people index in a certain way. What force would that have? If we recommend as a National Commission, that doesn't mean anybody has to do it. It's just a recommendation. Do you think it would really do any good?

MS. POST: We don't have anything like that up to this point, and I think that we certainly need to begin to have something like this. I think that it would do some good because we just don't have any recognition of this up to this point.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: That's an encouraging sign, to think that somebody believes we have some influence—very encouraging. We thank you for the compliment. Our next witness was to be J. Gary Nichols, the State librarian in Maine. His substitute will be Richard Gross, who is testifying in place of Mr. Nichols.

Statement of Richard Gross

MR. GROSS: I have no prepared text. I simply would like to express a couple of points of view that the State of Maine has about the issues that are before the Conference—primarily, the National Library Act. We are in favor of the Act in principle. We are part of a New England caucus that includes delegates to this Conference from the New England States. The members of that caucus also said that they would favor the Act in principle.

I personally have had an opportunity to speak with one of the authors of the Act from Senator Javits' office, so I understand what the authors of the Act are looking for in terms of positive indications from this Conference that will lead them to go on and refine the bill so that it will, hopefully, become a law. There are three or four areas that the gentleman from Senator Javits' office mentioned. I think that the delegates to this Conference should be aware of those areas, because probably most of them are not. They are looking for an endorsement of the principle of a national library agency, not necessarily where it will be placed in the Federal bureaucracy, or what it will replace if it will replace anything, but the concept of a national library agency. We also very strongly urged them to consider all types of libraries when they talk about a national library agency, so that all types of libraries would come under the function of this agency.

They are also looking for support for some kind of a funding formula, not necessarily the formula that is in this study bill. They are looking also for support for a national per capita standard of financial support for libraries. These principles were espoused by Mr. Morris from Senator Javits' office as the indicators that would urge them, after the Conference is over, to refine this bill and, hopefully, to push it through Congress.

Another area of concern that I would like to address is the coopertion between all types of libraries. One of the positive lessons that we are beginning to learn in Maine—and I hope this is happening in other States, from the Proposition 13 experience—is that we cannot continue to duplicate within small geographical areas the knowledge resources of this world. There simply is not enough money to do this. We have got to learn to talk to our neighbors in other types of libraries and in other geographical locations close to us. Geography is a problem in the State of Maine, because we are so huge. But many of us find ourselves in situations where we do have sister cities across the river, and we can talk to each other and we can do things that are going to save money in terms of the fact that we are not going to be buying the same resources, subscribing to the same magazines, and things of this nature. This becomes, in my opinion, an effort where everybody tries to work together to buy the resources, but not to duplicate the resources.

I really feel very strongly that this is a lesson that is coming very hard for many people, but that we will arrive at that point at some future date—and that future date is not too far off for some of us. If the cooperative efforts are to be carried on, we have got to stop talking about the public libraries, school libraries, and college libraries, and just talk about libraries. Whatever type they may be, we are serving the same people. These people have the same needs, and we have to cooperate, and see to it that people are the ones who get the information needs supplied.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Any questions by members of the panel?

MR. SPRAGUE: I would like to take advantage of this fresh report from Capitol Hill. In their consideration of a national library agency, and since I am a new member of this Commission—does what you have said imply the demise of this Commission, in their view, or a criticism of it? Or are they both to remain and have a life, if this new agency comes about?

MR. GROSS: This question was asked because some of the people on the committee that I was serving on, which Mr. Morris addressed, were concerned about creating another bureaucracy. The question was asked, but no substantive answer was given. Personally, my own feeling would be that we would not create another bureaucracy, another agency. There was a lot of discussion of the idea that this agency probably would fall within the new Department of Education. One thing that we did urge them very strongly to consider is the fact that this national library agency has got to serve the needs of all types of libraries, whereas the National Library Act specifically mentions funding for public libraries only.

Another thing that Mr. Morris did warn us about in our meeting with him is that the Higher Education Act is coming up for refunding in the next session of Congress. LSCA does not come up for refunding until 1981, I believe. He therefore led us to believe that there may be some very real problems in getting Congress to devote much time to the discussion of an Act to fund public libraries, when they already are committed by their agenda to consider Higher Education Act money because that is running out.

MS. YOUNGER: I was interested in your remark about requiring equal funding at all levels. How would the Federal Government go about that?

MR. GROSS: I'm not sure I follow your question. I didn't say equal funding. Are you talking about the funding formula or the per capita subsidy or per capita standard?

MS. YOUNGER: At one point you talked about all units of government having the same input financially.

MR. GROSS: No, I didn't.

MS. YOUNGER: I see. Then I misunderstood you.

MR. GROSS: I did not say that. You mean State, Federal, and local levels?

MS. YOUNGER: I understood that you were requiring a guarantee at all of those levels.

MR. GROSS: No. The authors of this bill are not concerned about the percentage figures at this point either.

MS. YOUNGER: Then are you talking about pure Federal funding?

MR. GROSS: No, we're talking about all three levels. At the congressional level, they lump local and they include State, city, county, whatever it may be, parish funding, as one amount.

MS. YOUNGER: Don't they have to require a certain level of funding per capita in order to consider that in the overall funding package?

MR. GROSS: That I'm not sure of. I don't understand the bill adequately enough myself to be able to answer that question. I don't think so, but I could be wrong.

A MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: According to my notes here, the person was suggesting that the National Library Act deal with all libraries.

MR. GROSS: The national library agency.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: I think you come as an advocate. You are like the rest of us, you're not sure what you're advocating.

MR. GROSS: That's right. I don't think that we should get tied down in 30, 20, or 50 formulas, or a $10.89 per capita standard across the country, at this point.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: I think I'd like to make an explanation here. The way the present Commission is structured, we are a planning agency, and not an operating agency. This bill proposes an operating agency, which probably would take over the functions of the present Office of Library and Learning Resources or something of that kind.

MR. GROSS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: I think there's really no conflict. In any case, this is going to be debated rather fully, I notice from the schedule of witnesses yet to follow, and there will be plenty said one way or the other. I'm sure all of us have been getting slips under our doors and been hailed by people asking us to sign petitions, or handed a brochure. So we will be very informed, I'm sure, or at least will hear more arguments by the time this White House Conference is over. We thank you very much for your interest in coming.

Our next witness is Helmut Alpers, who will talk about library conservation programs, a program that is dear to the heart of, I guess, all librarians, most library trustees, and everybody who reads a book that they're afraid is going to get worn out too soon.

Statement of Helmut Alpers

MR. ALPERS: I appreciate the opportunity to present testimony on the subject of physical preservation of information materials. I wish to address particularly the area of preservation of rare and valuable library materials, which are now stored in libraries and other repositories. A crisis exists which demands action now on the part of all levels of government and the public.

I believe a brief word regarding my credentials to speak on this subject are in order. I spent 18 years of my business career with IBM, during which I was deeply involved in information systems. In my last position, I was a key individual in IBM's data processing division—that's the sales division—responsible for bringing a networking capability to IBM's product line. For the last four years, I have been associated with the General Bookbinding Company, a library binding firm of which I am part owner. I want to further state that there is very little financial gain that our company would achieve though any major programs in the preservation area.

In view of this background, I believe I can bring perspective to this important subject, which I feel has been overlooked in much of the material which we have received. This is not a criticism. It usually is overlooked, since it is a problem of the backroom or technical services area of the library, and is thus out of sight. In addition, delegates had little awareness of this crisis in Ohio. It was only after diligent effort by a number of people at the Ohio pre-White House Conference that the subject of preservation of the information materials was discussed and finally accepted as one of Ohio's 16 recommendations.

Turning now to the problem, which exists primarily in our research libraries and academic institutions. There are also a number of public libraries that provide outstanding research collections, and these are included as part of the library community facing this problem.

We are here at this White House Conference to develop thoughts and recommendations that are key to the future of libraries, and I fully support this activity. However, in the area of preservation there is an immediate crisis before us at this very moment. I have attached, as part of this testimony, a brochure which my company made available to the members of the Ohio pre-White House Conference and which states the problem. It is entitled "No Tomorrow for Library Collections Unless," and you will have copies of that later.

The problem can be summarized by giving a few statistics. Six million out of 17 million volumes in the Library of Congress are too brittle to be given to users. Fifty percent of New York Public Library's five million books are in an advanced stage of disintegration. The Barrows Research Laboratory, which focused on this problem until its demise, determined that only 10 percent of the paper used in books published between 1900 and 1949 would survive this century, if given the best of care. Columbia has one and a half million books in its collection of five million falling apart. Publishers continue to print on paper which is not of archival quality. Archival paper is more expensive and thus books would be more expensive, which would limit the market. Therefore, books being printed this very day will be part of the preservation problem within the next 25 to 50 years. It is a problem which is compounded by the increasing number of publications that are being collected by libraries today.

Based on much of the literature which I have read in preparation for this Conference, one would surmise that the book is doomed. The November 10, 1979, issue of *College and Research Library News* carried as a cover article a synopsis of Stanford University's library director David Webber's address to the University of Oklahoma School of Library Science in September of this year on the subject of *Research Libraries in the Year 2030.* I quote: "Extensive collections of published materials on specific topics will remain the heart of the academic library. Despite many changes," Webber concluded, "libraries today will share a great many similarities in theory, operation, and a host of particular problems with those of the 2030's." Fifty years hence, libraries still are apt to have quiet reading places for students to absorb and integrate their classroom and laboratory studies with printed information in a variety of formats.

The codex format has been with us for more than a thousand years and has proven to be a most efficient means of presenting information. Commissioner Keppel warned us today of the great amount of time and effort needed to integrate new technology into a system. I disagree with Mr. Benington's assessment of his discussion with IBM development personnel. I was one of them. Enthusiasm by IBM people does not ensure effective acceptance into the marketplace on the schedule determined by IBM.

On balance, despite the many technological advances that have occured in computing in the last 20 years, and are sure to continue, along with video disc, enhanced microfiche capabilities, and others, the book is sure to continue. In summarizing the problem, we have a crisis today and one which is going to continue for the foreseeable future. I urge delegates to this Conference in each of the five theme areas not to overlook this critical problem.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: Any questions?

MS. LEITH: Would Z39 help us at all by imposing standards of paper?

MR. ALPERS: That's a good question, and, quite frankly, I cannot give you a good answer to that at the present time. My comments are very simple. I would air-condition libraries. I would start with that, because we've got books falling apart today in libraries that any new standards are not going to help. I am also talking about the future, but I'm looking back for the moment. I'm looking at the collections we've had since 1850. If you've been on your hands and knees in the New York Public Library stacks the way I have—that's what we have to stop, that problem that they have today, and at Yale, and Harvard, and Columbia, and all of the other libraries like that. That's the issue I'm really trying to address. We should look forward, I agree with you, on standards; but that's a tough one for me to react to, because it's very difficult economically to comment on.

MR. SPRAGUE: What would it cost to air-condition our libraries, and what would we get for that? How many years would we delay destruction of these materials?

MR. ALPERS: Regarding the destruction of paper, a chart which I have indicates that the life of paper can be extended by a factor of 12 with a 15° Centigrade drop in temperature (35° Centigrade to 20° Centigrade or 95° Fahrenheit to 68° Fahrenheit.)

Now, how much would it cost to air-condition libraries? I don't know, but I'd start with maybe $10 million, and I think that's practical. Even $50 million is not mind-boggling as far as I'm concerned, and I think we could get a crack at it with $5 million for 10 libraries.

MR. SPRAGUE: Which 10 would you do?

MR. ALPERS: Well, you've got four already. I'd do Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and New York Public. Those are the first four. Stanford has a new library. Their old library has not been air-conditioned; and I understand it's regarded as the Harvard of the West, so I certainly would include that as one of the five. You'd have to help me with the South and the West, other than what I've counted. But seriously, I'm not here to propose a specific program, as I indicated in the rest of my comments. I'm trying to say here, we're at a Conference where we're looking into the future. And I have found in my business career, when everybody is going in one direction, let's look the other way just to be sure we haven't missed anything. I do feel that we have missed this area of preservation here in preparing for the Conference. It only received 55 resolutions from the states out of 3,000. Why? Because two-thirds are lay delegates, as I am.

You don't know about the back room unless you're associated with the industry as I am through the bookbinding firm. That's why I'm here today. I've seen this problem. I have nothing to gain. I'm not selling air-conditioning or anything like that; I just want to see some of those great volumes and great books that I've had a chance to use at the New York Public Library saved for my children and their children and the children thereafter. That's what I'm reallly trying to say here in this testimony.

CHAIRPERSON MOORE: And you did. We appreciate your testimony very much indeed. Our next witness is Dr. Margaret Goggin, who comes to testify from the Association of American Library Schools on the topic of library education. Dr. Goggin recently retired as dean of the Library School at the University of Denver. She has had wide experience, of course, in her field, and has been a strong supporter of the continuing education network which this Commission started.

I would like to say at the present time that I must leave the hearing and I have asked Ms. Younger to chair the remainder of the hearing. Unfortunately, one can't be in two places at one time and I have to go somewhere else.

Statement of Margaret Goggin

DR. GOGGIN: I am here in the capacity of delegate-at-large representing the Association of American Library Schools, and I would like to emphasize something which we really all know but which often we forget to express. That is, that no matter what the deliberations of this Conference are, almost every deliberation will have some effect upon the education, the preparation, the in-service training, the continuing education and preparation of qualified staff to do the many things which the delegates are saying that they would like to see in the library of the 1980's.

The effective provision of library and information services to meet the current and future needs of citizens will depend largely upon the availability of competent staff to provide these services. The growing complexities of the information-based society, the changing needs of citizens, the new technological applications for information delivery, these and many more factors are dramatically changing the role of libraries and information agencies, and are demanding new kinds of education and re-education of librarians and information managers.

In whatever ways the issues of this week's deliberations are articulated, the emerging needs will require personnel prepared at graduate professional programs, at the masters, post-masters and doctoral levels, and staff whose competency is continually updated and reviewed through career-long continuing library education.

The Federal Government, through the years, has recognized that the formal graduate professional preparation for information professionals is a national concern and a national responsibility. The Higher Education Act has provided scholarship and fellowship support to graduate schools of library and information science to assist highly qualified students to prepare for a career in libraries and information agencies. The Association of American Library Schools affirms the national characteristics of graduate education for this profession and considers it essential for the Federal Government to continue the support with increased vigor as the need for preparing competent, dynamic leaders for the information agencies of today and tomorrow become more apparent.

We would like to stress the national characteristics of recruitment and preparation of graduate students to become professionals. No professional association, no professional group, is strong unless there is interaction between people from diverse cultures, from diverse backgrounds, from different parts of the country with different experiences. It is this divergence which brings to professional issues excitement, creativity, and new directions. It is for this reason that support of the Federal fellowship and scholarship program is seen as a national responsibility.

We are also concerned that the continuing education needs of staffs in all kinds of libraries are met through some form of support for the institutes and training programs, for staff development, for personnel, and personal development. It is the upgrading of the staffs in the libraries of today that will make it possible to meet some of the challenges that we will be facing at the end of the White House Conference, when we will have our resolutions, and some demands, and requests, and hopes for new, exciting services for citizens in all parts of our country.

Changes in the direction of education are requiring us to recruit a different kind of faculty member, and to update the competencies of those faculty members now in library schools in tenured positions. We feel that a very definite program on faculty development will need a subsidy to get started, will need some help and some resources, in order that we may have the best qualified faculty who can educate the new information professionals, and who also can conduct some of the research with their graduate students that is so necessary.

We have for the Association a resolution which we would like to present. I don't know whether you want me to read it or just present it to you in written form.

MS. YOUNGER: I think it would be better, in view of our time constraints, if it could be presented in written form.

DR. GOGGIN: It is in the document you have before you, and it does provide for support for library education.

MS. YOUNGER: Thank you. Our next witness is Robert Fox, speaking on libraries and contemporary literature.

Statement of Robert Fox

MR. FOX: In deference to Mr. Alpers, who is a member of the Ohio delegation along with myself, I would like to say that the books which my publishing company, Carpenter Press, publishes are printed on text stock that has a guaranteed shelf life of 250 years. But I don't think I'll be around then, or that any of us will, to know how effective that guarantee is. I am also very concerned with the issue of preservation. But what I'm here to speak about today concerns the role of the librarian, and the survival of our serious literature. You have my abstract and background paper in your package.

The traditional role of the librarian, as being responsible for the preservation and the transfer of our culture, is in serious jeopardy as far as the preservation of serious literature is concerned. Now, by "serious literature" I would like to distinguish entertainment literature, such as novels by Harold Robbins, which are used for recreational purposes, from serious fiction and poetry, the kind of novels and poetry that are very challenging. As Clarence Major, a writer, stated in a recent article in the *American Book Review*, sometimes it provides discomfiture rather than the pleasures of entertainment.

Well, serious writing is in jeopardy for one reason, because of a number of myths which abound about the publishing industry. I'll put it another way—there's an unwitting conspiracy that is responsible for a grave lack of attention paid to contemporary fiction and poetry. We are living in an unusual period of history in this country right now, when more serious fiction writers and poets are working more than ever before. Yet, the general public and librarians don't know that these writers exist.

One of the reasons why is because these writers are being published by the independent press. The independent press is filling the gap that commercial publishing has created. Commercial publishing has abandoned publication of serious literature to go after the big book and the million dollar movie, and to become involved in much of the information hardware and software that is the subject of this Conference.

The publishing industry has been taken over by multinational corporations. Since 1958, there have been more than 300 mergers and takeovers in the book publishing industry, and what's happened is that a supermarket mentality has taken over the handling of books. Since 1952, the number of books published in this country has more than tripled, and yet the number of serious works of fiction, poetry, and drama has remained the same.

What I'm basically concerned about is that our literature is the mirror of the Nation's spirit. Without this mirror, we cannot grow. We cannot continue to grow spiritually. We cannot continue to look at ourselves and understand what we are as a people. If we are to survive spiritually, and if our literature is to survive, several changes have to take place, I think, in the training of librarians. They will need special training about review media, particularly, because many of the widely used review media are owned by the multinational corporations that I spoke of and are representative of a very special interest.

MS. YOUNGER: Do you have a written proposal?

MR. FOX: Yes. My paper is in your books. And I would be happy to answer any further questions that you may have right now.

MS. YOUNGER: Are there questions?

MR. SPRAGUE: I'm groping here. What would you have us do? What can we do to change this situation and this concentration of publishing, the interest in popularity, and in the box office attitude toward making money? How can we change that situation?

MR. FOX: Well, I'm not interested in attacking the multinational corporations as such, although I think one has to realize that they have no allegiance to any particular culture and no responsibility to the products and the aspirations of any particular culture. But I would like to see some sort of awareness created about the existence of the network of small, independent presses that exists in this country. Perhaps this could be incorporated in library training, in library schools. It can be set as a priority. I would like to see some affirmation given for the acquisition of the products of members of the small press community.

MR. SPRAGUE: I take it that you feel that the library public at large is not aware of this network?

MR. FOX: Yes, and librarians could play an instrumental role in educating the public. But first by educating themselves, by becoming aware of the network and of those many review media that exist that do review books published by the small presses.

MS. YOUNGER: Thank you very much. Our next witness is Alex Allain.

Statement of Alex Allain

MR. ALLAIN: As I appear before you today, I wish to speak to the imperative need for understanding the importance of libraries, for I am utterly convinced that what we do here may well determine the course, the welfare, and the destiny of this Nation, and perhaps others, for generations to come. Time constraints make it necessary that I speak to the roots and the trunk, not the limbs, the twigs, and the leaves. Hence, I will go directly to the point.

Much has been written about waste. Yet there has been nothing in the press nor the other media about the almost criminal waste of our most important resource, our population, which forms its most basic natural resource. There are two essentials for the best human existence possible: bodily food, without which life cannot be sustained; and intellectual nourishment, without which mental acuity cannot be achieved. Whatever has been done in this Nation and elsewhere has been accomplished through the use of the mind, which directs man's literary, artistic, and manual skills.

The libraries of this Nation form the very heart of its educational system, and the compendium of human knowledge is contained within the libraries of the Nation and the world. Libraries are undoubtedly the most universally used tool for the acquisition of this essential knowledge. No lawyer, no doctor, no scientist, no engineer, no individual can function completely or intelligently without access to the knowledge which books contain. Human beings enjoy a reasoning ability centered in the mind, and nothing comes into that mind save through the senses. When education fails, knowledge regresses; and if we as a Nation continue to regress, I submit that we will certainly be buried.

Knowledge, however, is only a part of being a civilized human being. Another is the ability to understand. Even total knowledge, if it could be achieved, would only be the skeleton of a building which, without understanding, would have neither walls nor roof.

It is said that one may have much knowledge but, without understanding, be truly ignorant. An example of this might be the lack of understanding of the simple truism in both morality and law that no liberty in the context of the fifth or the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution grants any license to harm another's person or property. Failure to understand this basic doctrine has caused grief beyond measure, and the cost to this Nation of acts of vandalism, arson, and murder must run yearly into billions—though money is less important than the sorrow, the anguish, and the pain suffered by the victims, which leave permanent scars.

Complete lack of understanding is also evidenced by bigotry, bias, prejudice, and hatred. It has always been both morally and legally wrong to denigrate anyone's human dignity, within the meaning of a person as used in the Constitution of the United States, a meaning which excludes no one. A serious question must be posed—how much grief, bitterness, strife, hatred, and disorder have been caused by the lack of understanding of these simple doctrines? And how divisive is this lack of understanding of this simple doctrine? And how much does it undermine our national unity?

Understanding is as basic as knowledge to the full development of the mind, and that knowledge is stored uniquely in our libraries. The Senate of the United States tells us that $20 billion are being spent because of functional illiteracy. How much better these funds could be spent for other purposes. This is not to stress the money waste; but the waste about which I speak today as being almost criminal is the waste of our natural resources. Something must be done about it.

I propose that the highest priorities be placed on developing each individual to his fullest potential through the arts, the sciences, and technical, and manual skills. It was for this reason that the resolution, known as the "Louisiana resolution," was written for the Governor's Conference. It was approved by the American Library Association, and adopted by the legislature of the State of Louisiana, and copies were sent to the Louisiana delegation in Congress. The reasons set forth in the resolutions form the reasons I would submit at this Conference, for it speaks to the highest priority which must be given to libraries as the prime, though not the only source . . .

MS. YOUNGER: I'm sorry, we're out of time.

MR. ALLAIN: I would leave a copy of this with you for consideration. If you do not mind, I would like to give three recommendations that follow this.

MS. YOUNGER: I'm afraid that we can't because we are way over time.

MR. ALLAIN: Then may I just give them to you?

MS. YOUNGER: Please do. Thank you very much. We are all extremely sorry about what has happened with time, but we are very happy that so many additional people have asked for time since they arrived at the meeting. I think that it would be greatly appreciated by those who were not scheduled if perhaps you could limit yourself to two or three minutes and give some of them, at least, an opportunity to have something to say.

The next individual who is scheduled is Herbert Landau, representing the American Society for Information Science.

Statement of Herbert Landau

MR. LANDAU: My name is Herbert Landau. I am the delegate-at-large representing the American Society for Information Science (ASIS) and am the president of ASIS. We are an international professional society with more than 4,000 members, dedicated to the improvement of the information transfer process through research, development, application, and education. We are essentially an umbrella society, whose members include librarians, computer specialists, educators, information managers, communicators, publishers, researchers, information industry, etc.

I am also assistant director for information systems at the Solar Energy Research Institute in Golden, Colorado. My role at the Institute is the application of information science to solving one of our major national problems, which is energy. My job, therefore, as well as my professional society affiliation, is directly tied to the charge which I am now presenting to you on behalf of ASIS.

ASIS has prepared a statement of issues which is predicated upon certain basic assumptions regarding national information activities. These assumptions are that it is our goal—and by our goal I mean not only of ASIS but of the Conference—to facilitate the transfer of information from the source to the users, to solve their problems, and to deliver this information to users when and where they need it. The second assumption is that information delivery structures and information packages should follow need. The third assumption is that information funding at all levels—and this includes both private and public funding—should also follow need.

ASIS felt that any deliberations of and resulting outcomes from this Conference should be considered in proper perspective. The Conference, as suggested by its name, is organized to address both library services and information services. The structure of the five basic themes for the Conference enforces that organization. In the course of your deliberations, we hope that you have the opportunity to consider the eight basic issues, which I will briefly cite here by title, since the material you have describes these.

These issues are: 1) information as a national resource; 2) the need for a national information policy; 3) the application of technology to the improvement of library and information services; 4) information for the citizen at the local level; 5) public/private interface; 6) the cost of access to information; 7) international activities; and 8) research for information science.

In conclusion, I would just like to emphasize again that the name of the Conference is the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. I have been concerned that in many of the remarks that I've heard yesterday and today, and in many of the theme sessions, there seems to be a belief on the part of many delegates, and many of the speakers, that this Conference is addressed to libraries per se, and specifically public libraries. To reiterate, this Conference should, if we are not to do a disservice to either our constituents or ourselves, address the real issue of information transfer, using whatever mechanisms, structures, tools, and organizations that are available and can best satisfy the need.

MS. YOUNGER: Thank you very much, Mr. Landau. Cecily Cocco will now speak on library and information services in rural areas.

Statement of Cecily Cocco

MS. COCCO: My name is Cecily Cocco, and I am an alternate from the great State of California, a member of the Lake County Library Advisory Board, and president of the California Association of Library Trustees and Commissioners.

What image do you conjure up when you visualize the rural library user? Many of us traditionally have thought of the stereotype of the country hayseed who comes to a conference such as this with a stalk of grain firmly implanted between his teeth. I myself firmly resisted the offer of a "Where the Hell is Lake Port California?" T-shirt to drive my point home. No stereotype could be further from the truth; and, in fact, no stereotypes apply here, since the rural designation transcends age, ethnic persuasion, and economic condition.

The common theme running through rural concerns is, in my estimation, a sense of isolation. I concur with the California delegation's reaffirmation of the American tradition of a free and open institution for information, education, and culture, known as the public library, in the following areas.

First, libraries are obligated to reach out to the unserved and underserved. All barriers to such service, whether legal, fiscal, technological, attitudinal, or physical, or any other barriers, must be eliminated. Physical facilities and staff must be capable of providing services to all segments of society.

Second, there is a need for mandated, guaranteed, and continuous Federal, State, and local funding for libraries, with the understanding that the implementation of programs and services will be cost-effective. Libraries and information services should make every effort to cooperate and coordinate their services to avoid overlapping and duplication. Minimum standards for library services must be established, and local agencies must continue to administer library services.

However, your ideas of minimum standards of service may be quite different than mine. If I can make you aware that minimum levels of service in a rural library may not now include access to such technological breakthroughs as the telephone, the typewriter, card catalogues, and duplicating equipment—or even access to the building for the handicapped, as is the case with the Lake County Library in Lake Port, California—let alone sophisticated networking equipment, computerized information and referral systems, or TTYs, for example. If I can make you aware of those distinctions, then I will have partially discharged my duties to the Californians we represent. We may not be saying: "Stop the world, I want to get off," but we might be saying: "Slow down, world, we want to catch up."

Third, children are the future of our libraries. Libraries must ensure that the young are involved in the planning for all library services. It must be established as mandatory that State education codes set the specific amount of time for instruction in library usage from kindergarten through grade 12. Every school child must have access to a library.

Citizen participation is essential if libraries are to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. Libraries are visible. Support for and improvements in library and information services can only come about if the public knows what is happening and what is needed. The public must be kept informed by all possible techniques of all library programs and services. This is an essential duty for all libraries. Those in libraries must keep abreast of all future political, social, economic, and technological changes in our society. We must make certain that needed information is produced, and that it is disseminated in such a way that all who wish to can use it.

In closing, I reaffirm the recommendations of the 300 delegates to the March, 1979, California Conference on Library and Information Services, and thank you for the opportunity to present their recommendations to you.

MS. YOUNGER: Thank you. I hope that will be committed to writing and submitted.

MS. COCCO: Yes, it will.

MS. YOUNGER: We will go next to Caroline Grills of the National Micrographics Association.

MS. GRILLS: My capsulized message is about microforms. Microfilm and microfiche have solutions to information handling and linking problems.

Statement of Caroline Grills

I am Caroline Grills, representing the National Micrographics Association as the association's official observer. Microfilm has long been available in libraries as an archival storage convenience, particularly in relation to periodical volumes, rare reference material, books, and dissertations on microfilm. Today the Federal Government utilizes microforms in nearly every agency. Its use in the United States patent data, in social security records, military records, and the Government Printing Office, is extensive and vital. Microform is also meeting some reference needs at the Library of Congress. Certainly, growing storage and retrieval needs at all libraries mean that we should be looking to microforms to be able to solve some of these problems.

I would like to urge any delegates, as well as all other interested persons, to discover how microforms today mean not only a viable answer to archival storage needs, but also to learn how microforms can be utilized as information capsulized in mylar memory. Microform technology today is a device that easily integrates or links with computers, word processors, and even satellite communication systems.

Microforms as mylar memory can function solely as an information bridge to close the loop, if you will. Microforms in microfilm or microfiche can also be valuable tools to bring information to the visually and physically handicapped.

The National Micrographics Association maintains a resource center in Silver Spring, Maryland, and is ready to assist you with micrographic information. As the association's representative and observer at this important Conference, I will be available to answer your questions about microforms and welcome your inquiries.

MS. YOUNGER: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

A MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Are these free answers?

MS. GRILLS: Yes, there is much free information available. I would like to give one particular example. We have a Services to the Handicapped Committee as a wing of the National Micrographics Association. In that area we have identified many ways that handicapped persons, such as chair-bound persons, could access information—for example, a ramp leading from a parking lot to the first floor reading room within a library. That reading room could house more than a million volumes in one room if they were stored on microfilm, and there are tremendous collections of material now that are available, all current popular periodicals. I personally am the microforms manager for the American Chemical Society, and we have over a 100-year-old collection of journals in the field of chemistry on microfilm.

MS. YOUNGER: Thank you very much. Stanley Huffman, Jr., from the Virginia Educational Media Association and director of Learning Resources Center, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, will speak next.

Statement of Stanley Huffman, Jr.

MR. HUFFMAN: I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you this afternoon. I believe I am the only official observer here representing a State association that has a concern with both libraries and instructional technology. In this regard, let me redefine libraries just briefly for you and then proceed with my statement.

A library resource center may be looked upon as a collection of ideas in either print or nonprint format, retrievable in an easy manner so as to have utility by the pursuer of knowledge. To this end, we must move forward to the basic tenets of human learning by using visual and oral resources at our command for information processing.

Through the appropriate use of human and technological resources, we can satisfy the need for a literate society and for lifelong learning. The universal concern for learning at all levels must not be preempted. A primary concern for all people is to advance print literacy, visual literacy, and oral literacy to a comprehension level for achieving an educated society.

Human ingenuity and creativity are providing new technological dimensions in the use of print and nonprint materials. Printing, electronic, visual, and auditory technologies offer a variety of word processing systems. No single information resource medium can resolve the need for knowledge. The challenge becomes how to best meet the divergent needs of information-seeking individuals.

The designers of learning experiences, learning systems, and learning materials must take into account the varied interests, abilities, and needs of individuals, so that large numbers of people may be served. It may be necessary to create multiple message formats, so that communication channels may be selected by the user to accommodate different learning styles and individual differences and preferences.

Books remain an easily accessible, highly important component for developing educated people. By the same token, it is incumbent upon each of us to become more sophisticated in the use of technological resources as a part of the word processing and information system. Since library resource centers must meet a wide range of interests and needs, it is neither possible nor practical to stay with, or go to, one technology system alone. It is mandatory to find a delicate balance of resources, easily capable of being accessed for the fulfillment of individual desires and needs.

It is essential in today's world that print and non-print information coexist. The development of skills necessary to translate simple and complex facts and concepts in a functional manner is imperative. As individuals become proactive in message design, thought stimulation, and idea processing, they must also become interactive with available telecommunications technologies for the exchange of information. Also, individuals need to be reactive to achieve higher levels of information experience as a result of creative rearrangement of ideas. Again, as we perpetuate intellectual curiosity and integrity, no single communication system provides a utopia for man's inquiry. Therefore, it is mandatory that a variety of resources be accessible on a broad basis.

In the 1960's, we were saying that in the year 2000 we would have 2,000 times as much information as was known to man in 1960. At the present rate of information-processing, that estimate may be low. In 1962, I talked to audiences about the communication revolution of the 1960's and the 1970's. During the 1980's, I anticipate a transformation of research and development technologies into practical realities, for knowledge accessibility to provide individuals with resources to solve problems of intellectual curiosity and need.

There is an overwhelming need to fulfill the public's right to know, as a component of knowledge acquisition and lifelong learning, and to take advantage of the technologies which permit easy creation, transmission, reception, storage, retrieval, and replication of information. Technology exists to change the many facets of library resource centers, and its proper use will enhance our understanding of the many complex problems of today's world. To not use the many technologies which exist today, and to view libraries as a storehouse for books only, is short-sighted.

The new Department of Education is very narrowly conceived, since it does not give major attention to libraries and instructional technology. It is incumbent on everyone at this Conference to bring about the forces necessary to effect change in this regard. Professional associations, educators at all levels, and lay citizens must work cooperatively to bring both the resources and the technological balance necessary to serve the many needs of individuals. Thank you.

MS. YOUNGER: Thank you for your briefing. Our next speaker is Sandy Dolnick, president of the Friends of Libraries of the United States.

Statement of Sandy Dolnick

MS. DOLNICK: I am Sandy Dolnick, president of Friends of Libraries of the U.S.A. and official observer to the White House Conference. I would like to thank the Commission for the opportunity to appear. Our organization feels that you are all Friends of the Library, and we wanted to offer that opportunity to others and give information about our new organization.

Friends of Libraries, U.S.A., was formed to provide access to information and ideas for library support groups. We have learned to deal with practical day-to-day problems through our newsletter, which has provided material for more than two years to more than 700 such groups across the United States. As an educational and advocacy group in support of better library service, we will help stimulate and encourage grassroots advocacy, disseminating information with help from the Washington office of the American Library Association. We will help with our members' public relations efforts, to make the public aware of their existence and of the services they perform. We plan on publicizing the White House Conference results and their implementation across the country.

As we expand our services with regional efforts, Friends of Libraries, U.S.A., will help fill the void that has existed in the establishment of citizen support. We want to encourage the development of more such Friends groups. One of our first efforts is here at the White House Conference. Friends can be anything you want. Use us, please.

MS. YOUNGER: That came as a great surprise. Thank you very much. Are there any questions? I suspect that you will indeed be used more and more in the future. The next speaker is Cheryl Metoyer-Duran.

Statement of Cheryl Metoyer-Duran

MS. METOYER-DURAN: I am Cheryl Metoyer-Duran, a Cherokee Indian, and I am the library delegate from the pre-White House Conference on Library and Information Services for Indians on or near reservations. I have worked with numerous library projects on and off reservations in different periods, and I am currently an assistant professor at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, the University of California, Los Angeles.

Throughout the years, the information needs of American Indian people rarely have been recognized and even less frequently addressed; yet wampum belts, and memory sticks, and paintings on skin have been the traditional means by which Indian people have recorded, preserved, and disseminated information for the people in their community. Hence, information storage and retrieval are not new concepts to Indian people; rather, perhaps, the traditional Anglo concept of a library or a library facility is new.

The current status of library and information services to Indian people can be characterized by five conditions: 1) there is a lack of understanding and documentation of the information needs of Indian people; 2) we have inappropriate or inadequate materials to meet these needs; 3) there is an inability or unwillingness of public libraries in urban areas to meet these information needs; 4) there is a lack of library facilities on Indian reservations; and 5) there is a lack of a sufficient number of American Indian librarians to staff Indian libraries. To illustrate this final point, I cannot now name for you one single American Indian librarian with a master's degree in library science working in a reservation library on a full-time basis.

While there are numerous and diverse pieces of Indian education legislation, there does not exist one single law that specifies dollars for Indian libraries on reservations. We feel that this situation cannot endure. Legislation relating specifically to the education of Indian people has made possible the link between education and libraries. Indeed, the purpose of the Indian Self-determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 is as follows: "To provide maximum Indian participation in the government and education of Indian people; to provide for full participation of Indian tribes in programs and services conducted by the Federal Government for Indians; and to encourage the development of human resources of Indian people."

The development of Indian libraries as an element in the educational process of Indian people is therefore applied and implied in this legislation. A handful of Indian librarians—because there only are a handful—and a few committed educators, Indian and non-Indian, have in the past worked for the improvement of information services to Indian people. Now, with the increasing complexity of Indian life, urban and reservation, considering land rights and mineral rights disputes, the list of information-concerned persons is ever-growing. Tribal chairmen see information needs and information itself as invaluable commodities for governing their tribes. Economic and legal planners working for, and on, the reservations recognize the need for immediate access to information. And, finally, the local Indian resident, who simply wants to know where to register a consumer complaint, has come to recognize that a library and information center is the place and the resource to answer that question.

American Indian people have demonstrated their desire and their need for responsive information services. We have had successful demonstration programs. It is fitting and appropriate that with careful assessment, planning, implementation, and cooperation with other information agencies we will be able, in a local reservation library, to provide the proper information to the proper person at the proper time.

You can enable strong and continuing support for Indian libraries by doing the following. Work with us to pass the legislation that will provide fiscal resources for Indian library development. Indian tribes, and organizations, and agencies should be able to directly apply for these funds without unnecessary intervention. We have demonstrated our need and our desire for this. We mean to have it. I thank you for your time.

MS. YOUNGER: We thank you very much for your presentation.

MR. SPRAGUE: I will reveal my ignorance with my questions. What is unique about the Indian need for libraries as different from other people's needs? Is it just more or is there something specific?

MS. METOYER-DURAN: It is very specific. Indian people living on reservations—or really, I could say, all Indian people—have a very different relationship with the Federal Government. It is that of a trustee relationship. When the Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in 1851, that relationship was established by the Federal Government. This means that although people think, for instance, in a regular situation the local public library closest to the reservation automatically can provide library services on the reservation, that is not correct. There is no local tax base on a reservation. There is no mechanism for matching funds. Consequently, the people on the reservations do not have automatic library services.

MR. SPRAGUE: So it comes out of the structural situation. Can you speculate with me on why your associates, your colleagues, have not chosen libraries as a career? You said there isn't anyone with a master's, I believe.

MS. METOYER-DURAN: Part of that has been caused from within the profession, which has not made known that there is a profession of library and information science out there. In terms of recruitment, you must recognize that we are now competing against medicine, and law, and urban planning, which are professions that bring the immediate ability to directly aid the communities. In this sense, we librarians are like the public at large, because we have not sold our profession as being critical for the provision of information. The tribes do not have this understanding, any more, I would say, than the general public, and that affects the ability to recruit.

MS. LEITH: Wouldn't you also say that you have not had libraries on reservations? Therefore, the children growing up have not had the relationship with the library, so that that's not one of the things they want to be.

MS. METOYER-DURAN: Right. I was going to amend that and say that is why I go back to the fact that, although Indian people have understood the need for wisdom and information, we just have not connected it with the library, the librarian, as we know them in the majority society.

MR. SPRAGUE: Finally, I hope I don't offend you with this question, but I have been told that you're sitting on some of the most productive energy land in the world, which you do not choose to give up, and which you will lease or work out some arrangement with the country. Why don't you say that in exchange for 500 libraries, fully staffed, we'll lease the land to you or something like that?

MS. METOYER-DURAN: I would say that possibly there are trade-offs, but I would never attempt to answer why any reservation community would choose to go either way. I could never do that honestly. I could not answer your question as to whether or not we think that's a legitimate trade-off.

MR. SPRAGUE: Your bargaining position has improved, I understand.

MS. METOYER-DURAN: Considerably.

MR. CUADRA: How well are Indians represented in this Conference, both at the professional and at the lay level?

MS. METOYER-DURAN: From our Indian pre-Conference we have four delegates: one library delegate, that's me, and three lay delegates, with the alternates. Then across the country Indian people who were elected as State delegates and alternates, approximately 25. That's delegates and alternates across the board from the United States.

MS. YOUNGER: I want to thank all of you who stayed until the bitter end. I do want to remind you again that if any of you have materials that you wish to have go in the record that you have until December 3rd to get it in to the White House Conference office in writing.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the proceedings were adjourned.)

Open Hearing II

Panel Members

Horace Tate, Chair
Robert Burns
Joan Gross
Francis Keppel
Frances Naftalin

Testimony By:

Saturday, November 17, 1979

	PAGE
William G. Asp	367
Robert W. Frase	368
John S. Clayton	370
Dorothy Shields	371
Robert Stueart	374
Lois Ann Colaianni	375
Sophie Mitrisin	377
James Crayton	378
David Cohen	380
Vivian Balester	382
Roger F. Jacobs	383
Kamla J. King	386
Betty Taylor	387
Eugene T. Neely	388
Helen Faust	391
Bernard Corbin	393
Dale Hershey	394
Sandy Schuckett	395
John Smith	396
Ivan Bender	398
Alvin White	400
Theodore Soo-Hoo	400
Marilyn Apseloff	401
Linette Hunter	402
Margaret Stern	403

Proceedings

MR. TATE: Welcome to this second open hearing session scheduled for delegates who are attending this historic first White House Conference on Library and Information Services. I am Horace Tate, a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), and I will be chairing this session. With me to serve as panelists are four persons who are members of NCLIS, who will, if needed, address questions to the presenters or witnesses in an attempt to clarify or gather additional information about the presenters' testimony. These Commissioners are Frances Naftalin, Francis Keppel, Robert Burns, and Joan Gross. There are 15 members of the NCLIS, including the Librarian of Congress. I do see the chairman emeritus of the National Commission, Dr. Burkhardt, here at this meeting, too.

Assisting NCLIS in the implementation of the policies established by the Commission is an efficient staff headed by a dynamic and energetic executive director, Alphonse Trezza. I would at this time like to ask Al Trezza to stand and be recognized. For what he has done to aid and improve the libraries and library services in this Nation, and for what he has done in helping NCLIS to carry out its function, I am deeply grateful. I feel certain that I'm expressing the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the Commissioners when I utter this statement. We appreciate your efforts very much; and I for one, since I do delve into politics a little, appreciate your efforts in lobbying around the Capitol Hill to see that what people want in the way of better libraries in this Nation. This certainly is being pursued by you, our executive director.

While we know that recommendations will be forthcoming from this Conference, I know, further, that librarians who are to serve the people of today and the future will have to address the problems that have perplexed librarians of the past and the present. While I have heard much about libraries that would utilize networking techniques, data banks, and satellite technologies, I have not heard much about library programs that address the problems of illiteracy and problems of the handicapped.

While the library must address the problems of the literate, the librarian must also address the task of gathering and disseminating information to those who cannot read, write, and interpret information they receive. While we must be concerned about new technology that is available to the libraries of this Nation, we must be aware that thousands of people do not have access to, nor have an appreciation for, the libraries of our Nation as they exist at the present time.

Now, of course, you as representatives of people and libraries throughout the Nation, may during this open hearing address yourselves to any issue which you feel will enhance the American library and the services it renders and might continue to render—hopefully, will continue to render—to the communities of this Nation. During this open hearing, each speaker should have registered and submitted an abstract and a full text of his testimony. This is necessary because the testimony will form part of the official written record of this Conference. Anyone who desires to speak but has not registered, should register at this time, because such persons will be heard at the proper time, in the event preregistered speakers complete their testimony before 11:30 a.m., when we plan to stop the session. Each speaker will be limited to five minutes. Those who do not have an opportunity to testify today are encouraged to submit written statements. The record will remain open until December 3, and any testimony received within that time period will be included in the final official record.

The first person registered to testify this morning is William G. Asp, who will talk on an act for networking.

Statement of William G. Asp

MR. ASP: Chairman Tate and members of the panel, my name is Bill Asp. I am the Chairman of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA), and director, Office of Public Libraries and Interlibrary Cooperation, Minnesota Department of Education. COSLA is an organization consisting of the men and women who head the library development agencies in the States. Our membership consists of the State librarians of all 50 States and of the Virgin Islands.

Our organization consistently has supported the programs of NCLIS and has endorsed the national program for library development. We, therefore, are most eager that this White House Conference adopt recommendations for implementation of the national program. COSLA has developed a legislative proposal which I have filed with you as my testimony this morning. I would like to talk just briefly about some of the essential components of that legislative proposal.

COSLA has called for new Federal legislation to support library development in all types of libraries. Our legislative proposal, however, addresses one component in what could be a totally new direction of development. That component is library networking and public library development.

We see some essentials for any new Federal program for library development—some things which we call basic considerations. First of all, we feel it is essential that representatives of users of libraries, and representatives of all types of libraries within each of the States, have a vehicle and a mechanism to advise the State library agencies on administration of Federal programs within the State. So, our first consideration is for an advisory council consisting of representatives [illegible] all of these groups. We're used to working with these kinds of advisory councils. We feel that their contribution has been significant, and we urge that they be continued.

Second, we feel that, to accomplish a national program for library development, it is essential that all libraries which are recipients of Federal funds for support of any of their services share their resources with one another, within the statewide library networks, which are part of any national program. We also feel, in those States where multistate library networking is the most feasible approach, that any Federal program should be flexible enough to allow development of multistate networking and to allow ongoing support of that multistate networking to come from the participating States.

Our legislative proposal, as I have filed it with you, consists of five titles. The first title is the "Network Development" title, in which we recognize that for an effective national network to develop there must be strong library networks in each of the States. We propose, then, that a Federal program for development should include funds for the development and the operation of networking within the State, and we believe that this is a shared responsibility of the State government and the Federal Government. We also believe at the national level that there ought to be a national program which sets aside funds for research and demonstration purposes for library networks to be awarded to networks on a competitive basis.

Our second title is for "Public Library Services," and it recognizes that there is an appropriate Federal role to be played in provision of library services for all Americans. We recommend a provision for direct aid for public library services, but based on the State's adopted plan and the State's adopted standards and formulas. We also believe that there is a need for special purpose demonstration grants and establishment grants, again based on each State's criteria, on each State's plans. And we believe that there should be a provision for Federal support, shared with the States, for ongoing statewide library services for public libraries.

Our third title is called "Services for Special Constituencies." We recognize that there are needs for specialized public library services for users whose physical condition, economic or cultural stiuation requires that certain efforts be made to tailor library services to their needs. We recognize that there is a need for library services for institutionalized persons, for services to persons who are blind and physically handicapped, and Title III of our proposal calls for special services for these groups.

Our fourth title, "Library Planning and Development," calls for strengthening the State library agency, its planning and evaluation function, its research function, and its continuing education function.

Finally, our fifth title calls for "Funding for Construction of Public Library Buildings," for making public library buildings accessible to physically handicapped persons, and for acquisition and remodeling of existing buildings.

We see our proposal as one component to implement a national program for library and information services. It would allow an effective link between the Federal Government and the States for implementing your program.

MR. TATE: Thank you very much. The second person who will make a presentation this morning is Robert W. Frase.

Statement of Robert W. Frase

MR. FRASE: I am Robert W. Frase, executive director of American National Standards Committee Z39, which establishes voluntary standards in the field of libraries, information sciences, and publishing. However, I am not appearing today officially for that committee, because we had a witness yesterday who did that. Instead, I am appearing as an individual on the subject of the Protocol to the Florence Agreement.

The Florence Agreement is an international treaty to which the United States adhered in 1966, and it includes about 67 other countries. The original Agreement, among other things, eliminated in all of these countries import duties on a wide variety of educational, scientific, and cultural materials, including books, periodicals, printed music, and newspapers.

In 1976, the UNESCO General Conference, which sponsored the original Agreement, recommended a Protocol or an addition to the original Agreement, which would extend, among other things, that same duty-free privilege to other materials such as audio materials, visual materials, and microform materials. Since this is an international treaty, the President must submit to the Senate the Protocol as a treaty. After the Senate has acted, both Houses of Congress must pass implementing legislation changing our tariff laws to eliminate those duties that are now in the U.S. tariff laws.

Though I am appearing as an individual, because of my long experience with the Florence Agreement and with the Protocol, I think I might say that I'm appearing informally on the behalf of a large number of other organizations, including NCLIS, which have endorsed the Protocol. This would also include such organizations as the American Library Association, the Motion Picture Association, the Record Industry Association of America, the Association of American Publishers, the Author's Guild, and the Association for Educational Communication and Technology.

My testimony includes a resolution placing the Conference on record favoring early action on the Protocol, and several delegates are offering that resolution in the regular process of the Conference. I think there is no question that this is—as far as the Federal Government is concerned—the most immediate practical step that could be taken, and has to be taken, by the Government, to help libraries, their users, and educational institutions. Thank you very much.

MR. TATE: Are there any questions from the panel?

MS. NAFTALIN: Mr. Frase, that's an impressive list of supporters of the Protocol. Is there organized opposition?

MR. FRASE: No, there is no organized opposition. There is a certain amount of what we might call lethargy in the Federal bureaucracy. It took 16 years from the time the United States signed the original Florence Agreement until it became operational.

There is a technical problem which has delayed this, and that is another provision of the Protocol. It would extend duty-free entry to equipment and materials for the handicapped, provided that those materials were not produced in the United States. So such ordinary items as wheelchairs or crutches would not receive duty-free treatment; but if there were some special equipment which was available abroad, but not produced here, the duty would be waived. The Government agencies concerned with these matters have had a hard time coming up with the specific language to determine how this judgment would be made in individual cases.

MR. TATE: The next person who will make a presentation is Dr. John S. Clayton, who will talk on international freedom of information exchange.

Statement of John S. Clayton

MR. CLAYTON: I am John Clayton, a citizen of the United States of America. May I first express my appreciation for the opportunity you have afforded me to present a suggestion and idea.

The American society and the American strength were formed not only through the immigration of peoples but through the immigration of ideas. Both people and ideas were foreign until we made them our own—American. This is our heritage—the creation of a society open to the ideas and the contributions of the world. We must continue to build upon that heritage. To contribute toward that endeavor, I should like to propose that the Government of the United States of America offer to the countries of the world the unrestricted use of a dedicated UHF channel to present their views, culture, priorities, and opinions to the American people, so that we may have a better understanding of how they perceive themselves and the world in which we live together. Let us listen to them.

Of course, there will be some who will feel that the American people need to be protected from the influence of foreign opinion, propaganda, lies, distortions, or, in some cases, even the truth. I think we can do no better than follow, in such matters, the advice of Thomas Jefferson, who might well have been referring to television, but was, in fact, referring to the medium of his day—the book—when he wrote, "If it be false in its facts, disprove them; if false in its reasoning, refute it; but for God's sake, let us listen to both sides." The question is, are we, the American people, willing to hear both sides? Or, perhaps more precisely, are the gatekeepers and representatives of the American people willing for us to hear both sides?

That there are risks in allowing others to address our people without restriction is self-evident. We can be misled, fooled, our passions aroused. We are human. Let us be clear about the nature of the risk. We are not proposing to trust others. We are proposing to trust ourselves. Long ago the Greek leader, Pericles, understood the requirements of a free society when he contrasted the restrictions placed upon foreigners in Sparta to the open society of Athens where, as he said, "We trust less in system than in the native integrity of our people." Of course, in the world in which we live, trust is very rare; and it is not surprising that nationals from other countries find it difficult to believe that we practice what we preach. They scoff at our claim to free expression as a fiction, protesting that our news and our views are carefully tailored to disguise the truth from the public.

Strong argument for providing a public, unrestricted television channel for the presentation of national viewpoints other than our own is that it will represent dramatic, easily understood, and irrefutable evidence of the American commitment to freedom. Its emphatic statement will be that we do, in fact, practice what we preach; that we are unafraid; that we trust ourselves. To do this, I would propose the following:

1) that the people of the United States make it possible for everyone who owns a television set in the United States to have

access to a channel that carries whatever message or content other nations wish to make available to the American people;

2) that the people of the United States offer to the nations of the world the unrestricted use, so far as content is concerned, of these channels, so that they may present their views, opinions, culture, counsel, advice, observations, experiences, or criticisms without modification or censorship by any agency, public or private, of the United States;

3) that the use of these channels be available to the legal representatives of any nation recognized as legitimate by the United Nations, without regard to diplomatic recognition by the United States, and without regard to our judgment as to whether that representation is salutary or pernicious;

4) That we provide such access even if a state of war exists between us, in the belief that the more severe the stress, the more important it will be to hear and to understand opposing points of view;

5) that use of the channel, or channels, be restricted only by the availability of time and the need to provide equitable opportunity to all nations; and

6) that an appropriate commission be appointed by the President of the United States and funded by the Congress to achieve these objectives.

This is not the forum for an examination of detail. Rather, I believe it is our role to consider what recommendations and what policies we would like to endorse consideration by those who bear the responsibility for transforming the American dream into an American reality. In presenting this idea it is my hope that those of you whose lives are dedicated to the preservation and dissemination of the hopes and dreams and experiences of all mankind will find in this small proposal some contribution toward your endeavor, and that this Conference will recommend its approval and support. Thank you.

MR. TATE: The next presenter is Dorothy Shields, who will discuss service to labor.

Statement of Dorothy Shields

MRS. SHIELDS: My name is Dorothy Shields, and I'm the assistant director of the Department of Education of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. On behalf of the AFL-CIO, its members, and their families, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in these open hearings before NCLIS during this White House Conference. The labor movement in this country has long been an advocate of the free public library in the communities of this Nation. Indeed, we've a proud history and consistent record of support and testimony for library funding and adequate budgets in almost every community in the country.

Our concern and support for the community public library parallel our ongoing struggle to achieve free, quality public education for all Americans. In the early establishment of the public library, labor envisioned the continuing educational opportunities for all its members—children and adults together. In 1926, the American Federation of Labor, in convention, called attention to the necessity of the indispensable cooperation of librarians to assist unions in their educational work, particularly in the field of adult education. The AFL recommended that unions everywhere seek the friendly aid of librarians and that the American Library Association be kept advised of our needs and plans. We would have to say that we have had mixed success with our hopes and plans in this regard.

Labor's stake in the public library system is both individual and institutional. Indeed, labor's stake is an equity interest. Union members have a stake as workers, taxpayers, parents, citizens, and members. Unions themselves have a stake as educators and advocates for social reform and as partners in the collective bargaining process. Our findings indicate that libraries suffer from misconceptions and lack of information about both roles. We are here today to attempt to alleviate that condition and to promote a closer working relationship between two institutions important to the lives of working people.

Our members, as parents, look to the public libraries as a repository of rich resource material for their youngsters to use, particularly with special school assignments. At the AFL-CIO we have a special school program under way to introduce the study of labor into the curriculum in elementary and secondary schools. We hope that the public library will be the added dimension to complement the efforts underway in the classroom.

By resource material on labor, we are not only talking about bulletins published by the Department of Labor, as important as they may be. We are also talking about materials that reflect the contribution of the laboring man to the development of democracy, to music and literature, to the progressive social legislation for the safety, health, and welfare of workers and their families. We are talking about resources that illustrate the partnership of labor and management in the settling of thousands of collective bargaining agreements peacefully rather than resources that just illustrate those disputes that have reached an impasse.

We are asking that the contributions of the working men and women in their unions for the development of this country be given a fair and balanced representation in the collections and programs of the public library. You may have assumed that this was the case. Unfortunately, we have evidence that it's far from true, although there has been exceptional service rendered by such great institutions as the public libraries of New York, Detroit, and Minneapolis, to cite a few.

In 1926, the AFL suggested that we keep the American Library Association (ALA) aware of our concerns, and we have worked closely with ALA through the years. In 1945, we formalized our relationship with the establishment of the Joint Committee on Library Services to Labor, composed of union members and professional librarians appointed by their respective sponsoring organizations. This committee has worked effectively, providing and promoting services to labor through publication of newsletters, bibliographies, labor programs, and occasional surveys on library services to labor.

In 1976, the most recent survey was conducted among public libraries located in communities of more than 10,000 people and having a central labor council. I will attach a full report of that survey to this paper. It is still relevant today. However, I wish to highlight some particular findings that we found very disturbing. Attitudinal factors indicated that many libraries mistrust unions, and dismiss them as valid consumer groups—13.6 million members notwithstanding. This was indicated by one particular comment, and was echoed in many others: "Ask union members to check books out, not steal them."

Another public librarian stated: "Unions will ruin the United States. This library does not wish to assist in our country's downfall." Several librarians suggested purchasing high interest, low vocabulary or literacy materials for union membership, attesting to their assumption that union members have reading problems and ignoring the reality of the educational level of the average union member today—high school graduate and above. It is very difficult to repair and maintain modern equipment and machinery, or fly a 747 to Paris, and not be able to read. Many librarians went out of their way to indicate that basic information about union organizing should be excluded from the public library. I can't imagine how a student is to study the struggle of the migrant farm worker to gain equity in this economy in such a library.

The survey was significant to us. We, therefore, cannot assume that libraries recognize labor's contribution without further assistance, education, and in-service training. Moreover, they must have the cooperation and support of the local unions in their area. Specifically, we would like to see labor, along with other consumer groups, represented on library trustee boards in recognition of their role in the community.

We ask for a balanced presentation of the contribution of the labor movement in the library collections, and not necessarily confined to the history or business section.

We ask that local librarians have the necessary technical information and economic data to provide help for unions in their collective bargaining research efforts, or to make such data available to them through regional library facilities.

We ask that librarians take a fresh look at the composition of the American labor movement and discard their caricature impression of working people, a caricature no more valid than that of the typical librarian.

We ask that public librarians be impartial in their labor-management judgments when selecting materials for their libraries, as in the case of books about organizing.

We ask that public librarians work with union members and their families, who are major consumers of library services. We, in turn, shall encourage our members to continue to be enthusiastic advocates for the public support so desperately needed for libraries to fulfill their educational services for all our citizens.

MR. TATE: We will hear next from Mr. Robert Stueart, who will testify in place of another person who could not be present.

Statement of Robert Stueart

MR. STUEART: I'm Robert Stueart, and I am an alternate from the State of Massachusetts. I would like to summarize for the record the findings of a research study conducted by the faculty members of the Simmons College School of Library and Information Science and sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Libraries and Learning Resources. This is a survey into the everyday information needs of New England residents.

These information needs relate to occupational and non-occupational situations in which residents made decisions, sought answers, or clarified or solved problems. As a result of this probing of individual situations, the data for this survey provide insights into the behavior of information seekers, sources consulted, perceived level of satisfaction with source providers, institutional and environmental barriers to effective information seeking, and reasons for use and non-use of libraries.

The six New England States vary greatly in terms of residential sites, socioeconomic status, and availability of information sources. By providing the insights into a variety of information situations, information-seeking strategies, and barriers encountered in the search for information, a study of New England has relevance for other parts of the United States. This study is the first to examine information needs of adult citizens on a regional or miltistate level. It places library use in the context of specific situations and details the range of other sources consulted in the search for information.

Individuals from 2,400 households were interviewed by telephone. These interviews probed work and nonwork situations and respondents were asked to explain recent situations in which they had sought information in the past month or so. The interviews resulted in the mention of more than 3,500 situations, both work and nonwork. The most frequently mentioned situation related to consumer issues, job-related issues, housing and household maintenance, education and schooling, money matters, recreation, and health. These accounted for 74 percent.

When categorized into areas according to the themes specified for this Conference, 73 percent of the information needs related to the theme of meeting personal needs, while four percent related to the enhancement of lifelong learning, 20 percent related to improving organizations and the professions, and two percent related to effectively governing society.

Respondents were also given a list of source providers and asked to select those which they used, or were in the process of consulting, to resolve their information needs. The most frequent sources consulted, other than one's own experience, were a friend, a relative, or a neighbor; a newspaper, magazine, or book; someone in a store, company, or business; a co-worker; or a professional person, such as a lawyer or doctor. Libraries were listed ninth in the order of information source providers consulted, and they accounted for about 17 percent of the total situations mentioned.

Respondents were asked finally to specify why they used the library for the situation. Some 87 percent of those using libraries did so based on their perceptions that libraries held materials relevant to resolution of their problems. For those situations in which libraries were not listed as information sources consulted, survey respondents were asked why not. The most often mentioned reasons were: "didn't need libraries," "didn't think libraries could help," "had enough information from other sources," "didn't occur to the information seeker," and "past experience in failing to find what was needed, and wanted in the library." These reasons accounted for 76 percent of the total library non-use situations.

A final report, which is a much more detailed analysis, will be available in the Spring of 1980, and I have copies of the summary report for the panel.

MR. TATE: The next person to make a presentation is Lois Ann Colaianni.

Statement of Lois Ann Colaianni

MS. COLAIANNI: My name is Lois Ann Colaianni, and I am the director of libraries at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles, California. I am also president of the Medical Library Association, which has a membership of more than 5,000 health sciences libraries and librarians. Today, I am speaking on behalf of this association.

The Medical Library Association (MLA) shares with other library associations a concern about the future of information services in the United States. It recognizes the potential of this Conference to promote our common goal of providing for the information needs of our citizens. Many health sciences librarians already have contributed to the work of this Conference by actively participating in the pre-Conferences in their home States. In addition to these individual contributions, the MLA has prepared a position statement concerning issues which we believe to be of extreme importance. At this time, I would like to call your attention to the association's recommendations.

Our first recommendation concerns access to information. MLA supports improved access to information. Our particular interest is improved access by professionals and the public to health information. We urge the inclusion of funds for information services and facilities in all appropriate legislation, and we also encourage the expansion of existing library legislation to include health sciences libraries. The growing demands from health professionals, patients, and the public for information and education, coupled with the rise in book, journal, and audio-visual costs, have placed a tremendous financial strain on health sciences libraries. Past legislation has not always included provisions for information services to support new programs in the health field, nor have resources been available to provide adequate information for the fullest benefit to all people.

Our second recommendation relates to resource-sharing. MLA supports the development of networks which include all types of libraries. Health sciences libraries, because of their experience with the national medical library network, are oriented to participating in resource-sharing programs. It is not possible for any one library, whether in the health sciences or any other subject area, to meet every user need from its own resources. Health sciences library resources must be included in cooperative library efforts in order for these programs to meet fully the needs of their users.

Third, we are concerned about outreach programs. MLA supports outreach or extension programs that will bring health information services to those who are now isolated by socioeconomic, cultural, or geographic barriers. There is a critical need for current information in the inner city areas, as well as in the rural regions in which 46 percent of this country's hospitals are located.

Our last recommendation relates to continuing education. MLA supports innovation in and expansion of educational opportunities which enable librarians to take full advantage of new technologies and information management methods. If librarians are to provide the quality of services necessary for today's citizens and their information needs, they must continually update their professional skills. The pace of new developments in the field of information services requires that educational opportunities be made widely available to librarians through all stages of their careers.

I have summarized for you the MLA's position statement, which was mailed to all official delegates, and I have extra copies for those who wish them.

MR. TATE: We would next like to hear testimony from Sophie Mitrisin.

Statement of Sophie Mitrisin

MS. MITRISIN: My name is Sophie Mitrisin, and I earn my living by working in a library. Since I work alone, I do everything that has to be done in a library, and I have no wish to increase my responsibilities nor my duties.

A composite statement from two library texts, both dated 1950, reads, "Librarianship is a calling that devotes itself to bringing books into the common life of the world. Through guidance and stimulation of reading, librarianship aims to promote an enlightened citizenship and enriched personal lives. To bulwark and extend individual reading, there must be individual possession of books. Ownership of books has unending implications and possibilities. It may reveal unsuspected tastes, or stimulate unrealized capabilities. It will surely deepen and stabilize, in any household, the intangible elements of culture. Books are the most interesting and distinguished accessories of any home. They give a home character and meaning."

This eloquent statement addresses the potentials of book ownership. It is not the purpose of this presentation to suggest even remotely that librarians and libraries should engage in selling books or engage in other commercial enterprises dealing with the development of personal libraries. Libraries are defined as places for the retention of books to be used for study or reading and not for sale.

If librarians have neglected to encourage the individual possession of books, the neglect can be regarded as indigenous to the nature of librarianship. Book ownership involves a substantial exchange of money—customers persuaded to spend some of their money on books, and the equipment to house and maintain them. Librarians see their monetary decisions as being confined to the needs of the collection under their care—a collection maintained for use, not for sale, to provide for the needs of readers, scholars, students, borrowers, or patrons. They do not recognize customers, or purchasers, or even clients, as descriptive of a public that calls upon their services.

Librarians are notoriously uneasy in the exchange of money between themselves and their patrons. They recognize the usefulness of money. They know its negative aspects, as a punitive measure such as fines, to discourage the misuse of library property and the infringement of library rules. They know its usefulness as an exclusionary measure in the form of registration fees to limit library use. While librarians are well aware of the costs involved in the maintenance of even a modest library collection, they are not equipped by inclination or definition to move easily in the business of book selling. They see themselves as being required to provide a maximum of service at a minimum outlay of public money, and they find it uncongenial to talk realistically to their patrons about the cost of maintaining a personal library.

Librarians have directed their efforts toward the stimulation of reading, the pleasure of reading, the benefits of reading, even the necessity of reading. It is to be expected that people who buy books read them. Book readers are reported to be an affluent, well-educated group who like to loiter in book shops. There are those practical people who buy a book, go home, and read it the same night, and place it on their shelf where it fills up space. There are other less realistic accumulators who put a newly bought book on the shelf, where it must wait two or three years to be read. In either case, 20 or 30 years of book buying and reading is apt to result in an impressive accumulation of books which have implications and possibilities as a resource for the geographic and intellectual community.

Separate from the problem of reading and absorbing the information and knowledge that a collection of this kind represents, the owner has had to deal with the difficulties of selection, acquisition, arrangement, organization, the possibilities of insurance costs, tax deductions, periodic disposal of excess books, and eventually the disposition of a personal collection.

MR TATE: Miss Mitrisin, your time is up. Would you bring it to a conclusion, please?

MS. MITRISIN: I described further in my written statement the problems, the patrons, the programs, and the eventual product that could be expected from the encouragement of personal book ownership by the profesional library community. I am glad to have this opportunity to focus your attention on this problem which has engaged me for some time.

MR. TATE: The next presenter will be James E. Crayton.

Statement of James E. Crayton

MR. CRAYTON: My name is James Crayton. I'm an alternate from the State of California. I have submitted a paper entitled "Public Statement Regarding Concerns of the California Black Delegates and Alternates." It is, however, also a statement of concern of the California Librarians' Black Caucus of the California Library Association.

Both groups support the California position which will be, or has been, presented at one of the open hearings. We also support the goals and objectives of the National Library Commission that will work toward implementation of the National Library Act. We reaffirm the American tradition of a free and open institution for information and education—namely, the public library. We also believe that libraries are obligated to reach out to the unserved and underserved.

As we look at the state of library and information services on a nationwide basis and propose guidelines and set priorities for the development of library services for generations to come, I, as a representative of the California delegation and the California Librarians' Black Caucus, would like to call attention to the needs of the black community. These needs are often shared with others, but are more concentrated in the black portion of the population, for we are often more than one minority. We are sometimes the elderly, the persons existing at poverty level, the unemployed, the semi-literate, the shut-in, the handicapped. We are, too, the regular library user, the mid-income taxpayer, and the community model citizen.

Library service must appeal, and relate, to all aspects of black society, but focus particularly on the underserved. Sometimes libraries in the black community may be underutilized. Attitude of staff, content of collection, programs offered, and hours of operation may be at fault. Libraries, because of their governmental affiliation, are sometimes warily viewed by the black community. Every effort should be made to include black community representation in the operation and decisionmaking of the library. Some administrators have stated that the cost for operation of outreach services must be weighed against basic services, but they do this without providing basic service. I contend that outreach services are basic services. As part of the citizen involvement in libraries, black citizens should be included in decisions on what should be offered in particular libraries. This means that the attitudes of library administrators must change.

What are the needs of the black community? These needs should be entertained at this Conference. Furthermore, the needs should be ascertained from within the black community. To do so, lay people of the respective communities must be involved in decisionmaking.

In addition, every effort should be made to ensure that libraries are kept free, accessible, and open, and that user requirements are minimized and no fees for service charged. This is particularly necessary more than ever as computerized information systems, which are expensive, are developed and the cost is passed along to the user. This has the potential of forming an information elite based on the ability to pay.

The cultural contribution of black Americans should be recognized as a vital part and way of life. Funds for collection development to reflect the balck contribution to society must be available. In many libraries, special funds are designated for local or oral history collection. Rarely does this include records of the black community, which exists as a part of the larger community but may have developed quite differently from it.

Youth and children are our future. Careful and special consideration must be given to them. In summary, many of the needs of black Americans are the same as those of the majority and other minorities. There is an urging, however, in the black community to make the libraries relevant to the immediate and long-range needs of its citizens The library, on the other hand, is the most likely institution to provide this knowledge. Outreach service and basic service are one and the same and should be maintained and adequately supported as a national policy by this Conference.

MR. TATE: The next presenter is David Cohen.

Statement of David Cohen

MR. COHEN: I am David Cohen. I'm wearing two hats. I coordinate the Ethnic Materials Information Task Force for the American Library Association, and I'm an official observer for Queens College for the City University of New York. In that capacity, I direct a minority fellowship program; and we are now having our fourth institute on ethnicity and librarianship, which I want to talk about.

I have already filed a statement which contains some recommendations for legislation which would deal specifically with the question of materials and services in public libraries for ethnic groups. We feel the need for making this statement, because we thought that there was going to be a task force dealing with ethnic groups set up by NCLIS. Apparently it was never finalized, although there was still some talk about having some additional input. Librarianship is closely related to ethnicity, in that it intends to serve all the people in the community and to find ways and means to reach all the ethnic groups in the library orbit. It is also incumbent on this Conference to deal with the positive aspects of ethnicity in developing a national outlook on libraries which makes service to ethnic groups a substantial part of any library program, not simply a special feature added to meet prevailing, or persistent current demands.

This Conference should also consider what must be done through library agencies to combat racism and sexism. It must examine ways in which libraries can support ethnic minorities in our country in their efforts to overcome prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination, especially in print and nonprint media. We have made considerable progress since Philip Roth, in his *Goodbye Columbus,* described the scene in the library where the librarian is perplexed or uncertain of what to do when a young black boy walks in. Consider that in 1968, the National Commission on Civil Disorders reported that black students lacked motivation because learning materials available to them at that time had little or no relevance.

Progress is relative. When I get off the subway on 42nd Street and 5th Avenue, I go by the New York Public Library. On Thursdays it is closed. In addition, the branches of the New York Public Library have been seriously reduced in hours. I think that that's typical not only of New York but of the great urban centers in America, and that's something NCLIS must try to deal with.

You may say it requires money to reverse this disastrous trend, but I think you have to think in terms, first, of what this crisis means to the people who want to use the library. Those are the potential users and non-users, and those are the people we want to reach. If we're reducing the hours of the Tompkins Square Library on the East Side from 89 hours to 29, how in the world can we say that this is service to minority groups in that area?

The Brooklyn Public Library has set up a Spanish Information Center. It is funded under LSCA, and recently it needed another professional with Hispanic background, but there was no one qualified. That situation underscores the need for further training and further fellowship programs, which have been seriously cut in the present budget. I urge NCLIS to see what they can do about that.

Some years ago a reporter visited the Elmhurst General Hospital and discovered that the patients represented 20 different languages. Subsequently, the hospital developed a corps of volunteers to deal with those different languages. The public library should be in a position to do likewise. During my professional life we've reached about 10 to 15 percent of them, and the report on the New England survey gives a figure of 15 percent. Now, this hasn't changed materially. The Commission should see what can be done to move beyond that figure. Otherwise all this great talk about technology is meaningless.

In conclusion, I quote from the California Ethnic Services Task Force: "The ultimate goal of every public library would be complete integration of services to the point where a separate ethnic component is not necessary. Ideally, ethnic and ethnic-oriented staff should exist at all levels of the library from top administration to pages. Inclusion of ethnic needs in the planning of programs and services should be constant and automatic. All library staff should be interacting with the community, not just designated outreach libraries."

MR. BURNS: I am interested in the programs relating to English as a second language. I would be interested to hear your recommendations as to what legislation the Commission might support to offer libraries the opportunity to present English as a second language.

MR. COHEN: The Federal Government is thoroughly committed to this program, and there is a tremendous amount of money available through the Office of Bilingual Education. It is up to us, as the professionals, to try to develop bilingual programs and apply for money to carry out those programs. The Commission should encourage this, but at this point, we don't need any special legislation; it's already there. Although the focus is on classroom instruction, libraries, both school libraries and public libraries, have to go to the Office of Bilingual Education and say, "We'd like to encourage bilingual, and bicultural education in our district and we'd like some of that money; how do we get it?"

MR. TATE: Before the next presentation I'd like to reconize two persons in our audience. I serve as a member of the Georgia legislature in addition to my work in education and with libraries. I see one of my colleagues, who is representing the State of Georgia in place of the Lieutenant Governor. I would like to recognize Representative Gaylor, who is a teacher and State legislator. I would also like to present the chairman of the Georgia State Board of Education, Roy Henry.

The next person to make a presentation is Vivian Balester.

Statement of Vivian Balester

MS. BALESTER: My name is Vivian Balester. I'm a delegate from Ohio. I'm an attorney and a law librarian. The matter I wish to bring before you is the establishment of a national law library.

I think that it is an essential and critical mission for this Nation to have such a national law library. As a delegate to this Conference, and a participant in the theme work group on effectively governing our society, I have seen several different themes recur. One concerns freedom and the equal opportunity of access to information. Most often this is reflected in an expressed need for equal access to legal information of one kind or another. There has been another consistent theme; it deals with the collection and preservation of public documents. Many people are concerned that all kinds of public documents are not preserved in this country, much less made accessible to the citizenry. They are not even truly accessible to the lawmakers or the law enforcers. This happens on the local and State level more than on the Federal level.

People want to know what their laws are. They want to know what their regulations are. They want to know and have access to their municipal ordinances. People are recognizing more and more that their everyday lives are controlled by laws and regulations from all levels of government, and they do not have access to them.

It is my contention that the country needs a national law library to collect, to maintain, and to make accessible all legal documents which affect the lives of Americans so that we can plan a more effective social and political future.

It has also been predicted that we will become a less materialistic and consuming society. Because of this, it is felt that many citizens in the near future—that is, within the next 10 or 15 years—will be much more interested in government than they have been in the past; thus, they will need effective access to legal materials. The reason I propose a national law library is that we do not have any single institution in this country that is charged with the responsibility of collecting and, more importantly, making accessible to all people, all our legal documents. A national law library could accomplish this mission.

We have, within the Library of Congress, a tremendous law library, probably the greatest in the world. It is not, however, part of that library's mission to collect every single scrap of legal information that it could. It also has no mechanism for making these documents available to the rest of the world or to the citizens of this country. The national law library that I propose would do these things. It would maintain bibliographic control of all the legal documents from our country, wherever generated. It would make them accessible to the people by putting together a network of law libraries throughout this land.

The model that I think this library could reasonably follow would be the National Library of Medicine. This is a glorious institution which probably has changed the level of medical care in this country. The establishment of this library was authorized in 1956, and it has become not only the repository, but the actual disseminator, of medical and scientific information to the world.

With that as part of the background, I make the following recommendations: 1) that the national law library be established by the Congress of the United States; 2) that the Law Library of the Library of Congress be the nucleus for the national law library; 3) that the physical facilities of this library be located as close as possible to the U.S. Capitol and to the U.S. Supreme Court, so that it can continue to serve these bodies as they have been served in the past; and 4) that the Congress make findings and declare a broad and all-inclusive policy for the national law library, as it found and declared for the National Library of Medicine in 1956, and as it has consistently refined and reaffirmed, since that time, as set forth in 42 U.S. Code, Section 280b.

MR. KEPPEL: Is the Bar Association planning to introduce a bill in Congress, or has a bill already been introduced by some Member of Congress?

MS. BALESTER: I do not know.

MR. BURNS: What are law libraries doing to share their materials with other types of libraries?

MS. BALESTER: I don't think law libraries themselves have a duty to share their materials with other libraries. Another idea that I'm running into in my work group is that public libraries should make legal materials, at least a basic collection, available to their citizens. Further, because legal materials are somewhat difficult to use, explicit in the recommendation is the idea that there must be trained librarians on staff to assist people in using the legal materials that are available. It's very difficult for public libraries to maintain extensive legal collections, but most public libraries should at least contain a copy of the U.S. Code and their own State code, and perhaps a set of their own State court decisions with are digests for access.

MR. TATE: The next presenter will be Roger F. Jacobs.

Statement of Roger F. Jacobs

MR. JACOBS: My name is Roger F. Jacobs. I'm a law librarian. I have served in that capacity at the University of Detroit, the University of Windsor, Ontario, and Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. I'm a former member of the Executive Board of the American Association of Law Libraries. I'm a former President of the Canadian Association of Law Libraries and the Mid-America Association of Law Libraries. I'm a former member of the Board of Trustees of the Carbondale, Illinois, Public Library and the Shawnee, Illinois, Regional Library System. I am currently the Librarian of the Supreme Court.

I come before you this morning to make one simple point, which I believe is exceedingly important to the Nation. My point is this: The laws of this country need to be made more accessible to its citizens, and it is altogether appropriate that this Conference clearly and vigorously call attention to this matter. Every citizen, whether driving down the highway, buying a home or a television set, attending a meeting, cooking a meal, or teaching school—almost every endeavor known to society—is under the control, the regulation, or the jurisdiction of some law. Whether it's a statute of the U.S. Congress, an administrative regulation, or a city ordinance, formal laws and regulations are pervasive in today's society.

Political philosophers, lawmakers, librarians, and almost anyone who ever considers the point, recognizes that citizens in a democracy ought to have access to the laws that govern their lives. After all, are not these their laws? Are they not expected to have some basic familiarity with the rules of the society in which they live, or, at the very least, fundamental access to these rules? Merely to state the question provides the answer.

Yet to a large extent, access to legal material has been limited. The public development of collections of books and documents containing the law has largely been left to the formal components of the legal profession, the legislative library, the courthouse library, the academic law library. With minor exceptions, public libraries have not developed collections which would reveal the law, or explicate the legal framwork governing a course of action.

Professor Dan Henke, an eminent California law librarian, asserts that, "Few public libraries maintain extensive collections of legal materials, and as library support in many communities is curtailed, this condition may be expected to continue." My own investigation into the results of legislation relating to law libraries indicated that even in those jurisdictions which had the strongest legislation, the libraries were largely in the hands of the professional legal community. Even where legislation specifically demands that the law library be open to the public, it was generally placed within an institution which would have presented formidable barriers to public access. These barriers must be reduced, if not eliminated.

We should encourage the increased education of all of our citizens, the development of law courses in every element of the academic curriculum, from junior high school through the university—and a populace which is competent to read and understand the substance of the basic law books. When faced with the need for this information, the citizen will go to that information source traditionally available to provide continuing education on every subject—the public library.

What will the citizen find there? The Nation's laws as expressed in its statutes? In its regulations? In the pronouncement of its Supreme Court? The parallel documents from state or minicipality? In large measure, the public libraries in our communities have not had the human or financial resources to establish these legal collections. If they have had them, they have not provided the staff training required to offer adequate reader services.

This great Conference provides a singular opportunity to speak out in favor of principles aimed at, first, recognizing, and then remedying, this shortfall of resources. Specifically, I would ask this Conference to consider seriously the recommendations of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL). First, access to legal information is an individual's right. Second, that the Nation's legal health, like its physical health, needs public support. Third, the availability of legal information must not be restricted to the libraries of the legal profession.

I urge this Conference to recommend that the Congress and NCLIS investigate and implement appropriate programs which would encourage access to legal documents by all citizens; programs which will foster the development of basic legal collections in public libraries and the training of library staff in the use of legal materials. The law belongs to the people. Let us make it available to them in their libraries.

MR. BURNS: I am delighted to hear this message in view of my comments to the previous witness that the law belongs to all the people and it should be widely disseminated. I do, however, have one question which relates to standards of adequacy. I would like to know if the professional Association of Law Librarians has recommended standards on what constitutes an adequate law library? Something, I would suppose, similar to accreditation, but I'm groping here. Can you help me?

MR. JACOBS: I don't know if the AALL has developed any standards which would be directly applicable to the public libraries in our communities. Standards have been drafted, and tended to be drafted, for county law libraries, some of which may be accessible to the public. Standards certainly have been drafted for prison libraries, strangely or paradoxically enough. I don't know that standards have been adopted which are aimed specifically at law libraries. It's very probable that public libraries, depending on the community they are in, the number of people they serve, and the kinds of resources they have available, would have to have a flexible standard appropriate to their circumstances.

MR. BURNS: I suggest, then, that before we begin asking for money or funds to support such collection, we have some idea of what constitutes adequacy. What is our goal in developing an adequate response to user needs? This seems to be the responsibility of the professional association.

MR. JACOBS: That's a very good point, and as an association, and as librarians and members of the public, we can look to the good examples of some public libraries that have begun and have collected and developed the kinds of collections which should be available more widely.

MR. TATE: The next presenter is Kamla J. King.

Statement of Kamla J. King

MS. KING: I am Kamla King, a law librarian. I am here today to ask for support for basic law collections in public libraries. Legal information should be available to everyone, not just the legal profession. Recognizing this, the American Association of Law Libraries' recommendations to this Conference speak to the issues involved in making legal information widely available. To implement the recommendation that legal information not be restricted to law libraries, and that the use of legal information should not be a monopoly of law libraries, I suggest the following, based on my experience as a law and legislative reference librarian at the Connecticut State Library.

My first suggestion is to identify the legal informational needs of the public. Librarians are often in a position to know a community's needs before a book is ever requested. Public librarians have an inherent responsibility to know the government structure of their locality, their State, and the Federal Government, and further, to know the official legal publications of these entities.

My second suggestion involves education. After identifying the legal needs of a community, a librarian must learn how to service these needs. It is pointless to acquire law books without learning how to use them. At the Connecticut State Library, the law reference librarian and the Division for Library Development Staff have sponsored workshops for public librarians in how to use Connecticut law books. We all have a professional responsibility to share our bibliographic expertise. Law librarians can teach public librarians how to do basic legal research, the public librarians can teach law librarians the basics of general reference.

After learning about the community, and the government bodies under which it exists, and learning how the publications are used, a librarian will know what books the library should have. Thus, my third suggestion is to get the books. Buy, borrow, or beg them. Law books are expensive, and a law collection must be kept up-to-date. Drawing again from my Connecticut experience, I think that the State government is the best source of help in acquiring law books. In Connecticut, the Secretary of State is required by law to send to the State library 500 copies of the statutes and 350 copies of the session laws. From this supply, the State library then distributes copies to the public libraries. This statute is a good beginning. State legislatures could be pressed to make more titles available. In States where legal publications are printed by a private publisher, the State could require in its contract with the publisher, that copies be made available for public libraries free of charge or at a very low cost.

Public libraries need to ask for assistance. Law librarians need to offer their expertise and State governments need to recognize their obligation to their citizens. The White House Conference could bring these three together to make legal information available to everyone.

MR. TATE: I'm happy that you did not say buy, borrow, or steal. You said "beg". We appreciate that. The next presenter is Betty Taylor.

Statement of Betty Taylor

MS. TAYLOR: I come as a Professor of Law and the director of the Law Library of the University of Florida, as an alternate from the State of Florida, and the chairman of the Special Network Committee of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL).

We in AALL have been involved in developing a law network over a number of years, and as a first phase we propose to emulate the medical profession's development of a very sophisticated networking system for medical literature, exchange of data, and information. We have been working on this program for the last 10 years in cooperation with the Association of American Law Schools and the American Bar Association to develop a network of legal information for the legal community and for the population as a whole.

We have formed a special committee and hired a consultant whose report encouraged us to continue with our efforts to develop a bilbiographic data base. In the meantime most of the law school libraries in the country participate in existing data bases—OCLC or RLIN, and other specialized data bases. However, the information in these data bases is not generally available or consolidated in any form. Our first undertaking is to combine the information that is available in these various data bases into a consolidated legal data base. This would provide an opportunity, in response to Mr. Burns' question, to alert everyone in the country to the location of legal resources. And I believe that, at least on the academic level, most law libraries are willing to exchange and lend legal information generally in the country.

It is not our intent to build another data base in competition with these other national networks that already exist, but to consolidate this information with many other types of legal information that exist now in some data bases, or to encourage the development of legal data bases which do not presently exist, and to consolidate all this information into one national law network that would be available to the legal community and to other users with a need for legal information.

Presently, these national data bases in bibliographic form are available only to nonprofit institutions. One of the reasons we are encouraging the development of this special law network is to serve our constituency, which, in large measure, constitutes profit-making organizations. Thirty-eight percent of the libraries represented in the AALL are profit libraries. Under the organization of these national networks, profit libraries are not permitted to access data because of the nonprofit status of the national networking organizations. These libraries are a large constituency in the law library field that we desire to serve and who want access to bibliographic information.

Forty-four percent of the law libraries in the AALL are governmental and county libraries that cannot justify access to these national data bases because of the limited use they would make of them. However, if we were able to offer other services along with the bibliographic searching and cataloging services, access would be justified.

The committee and the association believe that continued support of the national library network would enable the law libraries to participate in a national networking system. We would like to be included in any proposal from the White House Conference that would provide for a law bibliographic network.

We also urge the Conference to present recommendations requiring cooperation and exchange of data among existing data bases in this country, and dissemination of data to users without regard to their profit status. LAWNET would like to be a participant in any proposal for organizing, funding, and disseminating information in a national library network.

MR. BURNS: I would like Ms. Taylor to respond to my question to an earlier witness, regarding the adequacy of the law library. Are there any standards or any guidelines?

MS. TAYLOR: There are specific standards for all school libraries, because these are easy to identify and are a small group. There are no standards for other libraries in the profession, because of the diversity of interests, the specialties of these libraries, whether corporate or public, and the great diversity of funding available to them.

MR. TATE: The next presenter is Eugene T. Neely.

Statement of Eugene T. Neely

MR. NEELY: My name is Eugene Neely. I'm coordinator of public services of the General Library at the University of Missouri, Kansas City, and the current chairperson of the statistics section of the American Library Association. I'm speaking today as the chairperson of the statistics section. I call to the attention of the commissioners, and the delegates to the Conference, some of the problems the library profession is experiencing with the publication of library statistical data compiled by the Federal Government. Specifically, I would like to discuss the lack of responsiveness of the Federal Government in meeting the needs for library statistics, particularly the lengthy and sometimes unreasonable delays in disseminating the results of library surveys in printed or in other easily accessible forms.

The pressing needs of individual libraries, and of local, State, and national government agencies, for current statistical information are underscored this year by this Conference. The coordinating and executive committees of the statistics section, meeting in joint session at the ALA's Dallas Conference last June, resolved as follows:

"Whereas, the statistics section of the Library Administration and Management Association of the American Library Association recognizes the great value of up-to-date information about libraries as collected in the National Center for Education Statistics library surveys, the statistics section strongly recommends that the National Center for Education Statistics give top priority to reducing the delay between the collection of library survey data and the publication of those data to make them quickly accessible and useful."

On page 60 of the analysis of pre-White House Conference activities, "Issues and Resolutions," which was published and mailed to all White House Conference delegates, the following suggested resolution appears under theme four, goal two:

"The Federal Government should provide for the collection and dissemination of library statistics using standard terminology. A minimum three-year production cycle should be maintained for all types of libraries."

I would like to ask this Conference and NCLIS to adopt an expanded resolution on library statistical surveys by the Federal Government as follows:

"Whereas, national library statistical surveys have been conducted since the 1970's by the U.S. Office of Education, and since 1966 by the National Center for Education statistics, and are now being transferred to the Department of Education; and

"Whereas, national library statistics have been used as a basic method for describing the characteristics of all types of libraries; and

"Whereas, library statistics have provided primary data for evaluating library services, performance, and needs; and

"Whereas, library statistics have been used by Congress and various Presidential Administrations to improve legislation in support of libraries, such as the Library Services and Construction Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act;

"Therefore be it resolved, that the Secretary of Education be requested to retain at least the three-year cycle for basic library surveys, that is, public, academic and school, and that other surveys of libraries be conducted at least every six years, and that this schedule be maintained by the national library agency should such agency be established by Congress; and

"Be it further resolved, that new or repeated surveys on critical issues be regularly conducted in support of developing library legislation—such as that for the National Library Act, the National Periodical Center, and the Library Manpower Study; and

"Be it further resolved, that the results of library surveys conducted by the Federal Government be released and printed, or put in some other easily accessible form, within 12 months after the deadline for return of survey forms by respondents; and

"Be it further resolved, that the responsibility for library statistical surveys be placed under that office of the Department of Education responsible for administering other federally supported library programs, and that it be placed under the national library agency, if and when such agency is established."

MR. BURNS: I have a number of questions. A continuing source of annoyance and bother to librarians is this gap between the collection of data by the Federal Government and the distribution of these data to the concerned parties, the respondents. I think it's a matter of critical importance, and one that needs to be addressed.

My first question addresses a number of small surveys conducted: What do you consider to be the greatest problem related to the collection of these surveys?

MR. NEELY: There are delays throughout the process, from authorization and clearance procedures on through. However, the chief and most significant time delays occur with publication rather than data collection, according to the best information I have. It usually takes less than 12 months to produce a clean data base—frequently considerably less than 12 months. But, it can take considerably more than an additional 12 months before a clean data base becomes a published or easily accessible one.

MR. BURNS: What, specifically, are the chief causes for these delays?

MR. NEELY: The chief cause is that the responsibility for library surveys lies within the National Center for Education Statistics, which is responsible for all educational surveys. As such, library surveys must compete with all other educational surveys for funding and staffing. That's why I address that issue in the resolution—the matter of placing library surveys under whatever office becomes responsible for library programs.

MR. BURNS: In view of that, where should the Department of Education place responsibility for library statistics?

MR. NEELY: I'm not speaking now for the statistics section, because I don't think we have had an opportunity to discuss this. My hope is that either a national library agency be established, or that, if library programs continue to be in the new Department of Education, they should be placed at a very high level; for example, under an Undersecretary of Education for Library and Information Service, an office, or a division, or a bureau. That would be appropriate, and then library statistical surveys would become a part of that office.

MR. BURNS: How many statistical surveys are conducted annually at the national level?

MR. NEELY: They are decreasing every year, because of the problems we have already enumerated. In 1975, there were five surveys. In 1976, there were four; in 1977, four; in 1978, three. In 1979, there were only two library surveys, and three have been approved for 1980.

MR. BURNS: I find this appalling. Obviously this number is not adequate.

MR. NEELY: I agree.

MR. BURNS: How many surveys would you consider adequate?

MR. NEELY: Generally speaking, at least four. Of course, this depends on which surveys are being conducted. This would also fluctuate with the need for specific surveys on a given subject.

MR. BURNS: I hope you will send specific recommendations to the Commission on this matter. This is a continuing source of annoyance.

MR. TATE: Now we will hear from Helen Faust.

Statement of Helen Faust

MS. FAUST: My name is Helen Faust, and I am the chair of the Board of Managers of an organization called Girls Coalition. All of my working life, I have been involved, in one way or another, with programs for children, either in the schools or in the community. I'm also a member of the Citizens Committee on Services for Children and Youth in Philadelphia.

Our society cares about children. In this, the International Year of the Child, in thousands of special programs throughout the Nation we have demonstrated our commitment to the rights of children—their right to adequate food, clothing and shelter; their right to protection of their health and welfare; their right to respect for their emerging individuality; their right to the love and care of parents or substitute parents; and their right to an appropriate education. We invest huge sums in programs for children because of our fundamental belief that every child should have the opportunity to develop to his or her full potential.

I am very proud to be a citizen of a Nation which places such a high priority on the healthy development of children and does not begrudge one cent of the tax dollars or voluntary contributions used in their behalf. In fact, my interest in testifying here today reflects my belief that we need to invest more funds in libraries if we are to make them the lifelong learning source they have the potential to be.

While lifelong resources are needed by people of all ages, my special interest is in the needs of children and youth for a system which provides both school-related and community-based libraries. We have, in this country, a marvelous network of schools, technical institutes, colleges, and universities. Modern, well-equipped libraries are an essential component of all of these institutions.

The expansion of our knowledge in literature—books, magazines, films, tapes, slides, records, and all sorts of documents—means that no single teacher, nor any single text, can present a complete and accurate picture of any one subject. If schools are to approach the ideal of making truth accessible to youth, they must have adequately funded libraries.

How libraries ensure the level of bibliographical support for all of the curriculum areas is another issue, and one which I'm happy to leave to the library professionals, with the expectation, however, that they are addressing this concern continually. It is, however, obvious to me, a layman, that, if school libraries are to provide the kind of support needed, they will require increased funding, as well as some system of interlibrary cooperation.

Another concern is the need of children and youth for the community-based library as a resource for independent, self-motivated, and self-directed learning. Schools at all levels, with the possible exceptions of kindergarten and the upper graduate level, are committed to objectives defined by society. We expect from our formal educational system the teaching of basic skills, preparation at each level for the demands of the next higher level. We add the expectation of preparation for citizenship, for family life and enjoyment of the arts. In short, formal education is expected to prepare an individual for the tasks of living in a highly complex world.

This is not to deny that many good teachers and good schools employ methods which foster self-directed learning and the love of learning for its own sake. However, the reality is that the complexity and the pressures of demand upon formal educational institutions frequently limit their options.

Children need the freedom libraries and museums offer, where they are available. Where museums are not available, libraries should supply some of the same experiences. Children need the freedom to browse and to have experiences which stimulate their curiosity, to examine, without a set purpose, books, periodicals, pictures, which may spark an intellectual interest, and foster independent study.

Children also need to have resources for pursuing their own natural curiosity. If they are lucky, that curiosity may be satisfied in the classroom, but often that curiosity involves some subject not related to the current curriculum. A child captivated by the song of a bird or by the sight of a butterfly may well be stimulated to begin the study of natural sciences on his own. A child living close to an airport may begin to wonder how flight in huge machines is possible. The nurturing of such interest can affect the whole of life, either through career choice, or through the joy of knowledge for its own sake.

The list of possible experiences, taken for granted by adults but highly stimulating to the intellectual curiosity of a child, is endless. Sometimes the significant adults in a child's life can answer those questions. More often they cannot.

I hope that the Conference continues its strong support for libraries which recognize the needs of children and have the facilities for responding, for I think this is clearly one way of meeting our Nation's need for intellectual development.

MR. TATE: The next presenter is Bernard Corbin.

Statement of Bernard Corbin

MR. CORBIN: My name is Bernard Corbin, director of the Philadelphia Urban Coalition. I'm here on behalf of Johnny Bowser, executive director of the Urban Coalition, who was unable to attend. The Philadelphia Urban Coalition is a nonprofit social service agency, financially supported by 102 Philadelphia area corporations at a level of approximately $1 million annually. In addition, the Urban Coalition enjoys an effective relationship with all levels of government, and receives about $800,000 in grants from government agencies to improve services and the quality of life for Philadelphia's disadvantaged citizens. The coalition is led by a prestigious 65 member board of directors from business, labor, government, community organizations, and industry. I appreciate this opportunity to testify, specifically on behalf of Philadelphia's urban poor, and generally on behalf of the urban poor throughout the country.

The growth and the development of our country have thrived on the premise of a universal education and the expectation that every citizen could, and should, make a positive contribution to society. We have not displayed a "rich-only" sign, and historically we have supported a rags-to-riches performance.

The dilemma facing the urban poor is tremendous. They are devastated by spiraling inflation, rising interest rates, and a higher rate of unemployment in our older cities than the national average. The quality of life and the quality of services provided by cities, heavily dependent on a shrinking tax base, declines sharply in our energy-sensitive, inflation-oriented society. The White House Conference on Library and Information Services offers a unique opportunity to surface the issue of older cities which, unfortunately, are heavily populated with the urban poor, and which are unable to maintain both full service and accessible neighborhood library facilities, and a full range of other data and information services.

We must not deny these Americans access to information and, as a consequence, deny our country continued growth and innovation because of a shrinking tax base. The need for Federal funding and intervention is now. It is necessary. It is practical. It is the only means of continuing the true meaning of universal education. A developed mind is as important to our national security and economic growth as a developed country.

I urge this Conference to endorse direct Federal financial support to libraries, especially those in older cities, where an objective measure of poverty and disadvantaged living can be determined. Such a proposal is important to our country and necessary to all of our citizens.

MR. TATE: We will now hear from Mr. Hershey.

Statement of Dale Hershey

MR. HERSHEY: I'm Dale Hershey. I am a rural sociologist and community development specialist with Pennsylvania State University. For the past two years, I have been working with the faculty at Clarion State College in developing a center for rural librarianship. My comments today focus on the importance of and the unique problems associated with providing information and library services in rural areas.

Information needs, and the problems of meeting these needs, are related to, and compounded by, a number of key social and demographic facts about rural areas in contrast with urban areas. The social and demographic characteristics of rural areas include: 1) low population density; 2) large geographic expanses; 3) lack or sparsity of human service related resources; 4) greater capital flow to urban areas; 5) historic erosion of the population and tax bases through migration of rural residents to urban areas; and 6) the reversal of these migration trends during the 1970's.

The information and library needs of rural Pennsylvanians are particularly desperate. Each year the Bureau of Library Development makes a survey of all public library services to determine State aid eligibility. The most recent survey shows that well over one million rural Pennsylvanians either are without library services or are served inadequately. That means that more than 11 percent of the State's population have limited access to information services.

In the past, continuing through the present, rural libraries have received meager support at the local, State, and national levels. On a per capita basis, rural libraries are inadequately funded compared with urban libraries. In a 1978 survey in Pennsylvania, the average per capita expenditure for rural libraries was $4.15. This was a dollar below the State average. Pittsburgh had a per capita average of $6.75 and in Philadelphia it was $7.38.

Information services inevitably are limited when the financial support for rural libraries is so small. With this low level of support, it is not surprising that rural information services are restricted because of the unavailability of professional staff. Rural libraries are forced to rely on volunteers. The irony is that, while greater skill and creativity are required to cope with the limited collections of resources, these same libraries are staffed by untrained librarians.

A third and related problem is restricted information access and flow. Untrained staff are forced to work with limited collections, and while resources may be available through interlibrary loan services and data banks, untrained staff in rural libraries often are not aware of these services. This problem is further complicated because even the most basic resources may be unavailable to rural libraries. Some rural libraries don't even have telephones. Resources and data banks, no matter how well developed, just are not available to these libraries and their users.

A final, but equally important, factor is the lack of sponsorship, or coordinated spokesmanship, at the national level. As in so many of the human and physical services, research, planning, and funding in the area of information services are based on urban needs and urban problems. The result is low-level funding for rural libraries. Lacking strong national visibility, the needs and problems of rural areas are overlooked.

The following recommendations are critical for planning the provision of information and library services in rural areas: 1) a continued emphasis should be placed on meeting the funding needs of underserved rural areas; 2) rural libraries require support enabling them to provide the basic information and library services that have been available for years in urban areas; 3) there is a need for ongoing training for the professional and voluntary library staff in rural libraries. Rural librarians need training, not only in basic library science skills, but also in the creative application and utilization of limited collections and resources, and 4) there is a need for national recognition of the importance, and the unique problems, of providing information and library services in rural communities. We cannot overlook a geographic sector representing one-third of our national population.

MR. BURNS: I'm interested in what role you see for the National Agricultural Library in library services to rural areas, and whether you are using any of the programs from the National Agricultural Library.

MR. HERSHEY: I'm familiar with the National Agricultural Library. We use it through the extension service. I would like to see rural libraries have greater access to that library; I don't think many rural libraries are even aware of the services it provides. It would be a valuable resource, one of those resources that is overlooked.

MR. BURNS: Do you see any ways NCLIS could encourage this?

MR. HERSHEY: I am not a librarian, so I would have to leave that answer to the professional librarian.

MR. TATE: We will now hear from Sandy Schuckett.

Statement of Sandy Schuckett

MS. SCHUCKETT: My name is Sandy Schuckett, and I am an alternate delegate from Los Angeles. I teach children how to use libraries. I am here to speak on the position of the California delegation, and specifically on children's library instruction in schools.

The California delegation to this Conference affirms the American tradition of a free and open institution for information, education, and culture, known as the public library. We believe that libraries have an obligation to reach out to the unserved and the underserved, and that all barriers to such service must be removed. We fully support a National Library Act, which would mandate and guarantee continuous Federal funding in a matching Federal-State-local basis, minimum standards for library services, adequate citizen participation, library services for special needs, and interlibrary cooperation. We further believe the Act should be expanded to include school, college, medical, research, and other libraries. This is one of the questions that Senators Javits and Kennedy asked in the bill they presented to Congress.

We believe that support for improvement in library and information services must come about through an informed public that knows what is happening and what is needed, and that is an essential duty for all libraries. We must make sure that needed information is produced and disseminated so that those who need it can find it and use it.

Our children are the future of this Nation and the future of libraries. For this reason, the California delegation, at our Governor's Conference in March, 1979, supported, by an 89 percent vote, a resolution urging that a specified amount of time be set aside for instruction in library use at all grade levels, kindergarten through 12, in our public schools. We believe that through such instruction a child, beginning with his first year in school, will develop positive attitudes toward libraries and what they have to offer. The school library, with an organized developmental instructional program, can furnish not only materials of consistent excellence, but also a background of information that stimulates growth and literary appreciation, factual knowledge, culture, and aesthetic values, so that our children can develop good judgment and critical thinking.

A school library program can inculcate in children a lifetime habit of research skills. The kinds of skills taught in school libraries are so useful that they can serve students throughout all levels of their schooling. For students who choose not to attend institutions of higher learning, these habits will open the door to future library use which will meet personal needs and increase learning throughout life. These skills can be used in any type of library, in any location, in any country, in any language, and can serve for life.

A child who has access, at an early age, to an organized program of library skills and the appreciation of literature, probably will grow up to be a lifelong taxpaying supporter and user of libraries. Therefore, the California delegation, in agreement with those of Arizona, Michigan, New York, Texas, Florida, and Connecticut, all of whom supported similar resolutions in their State conferences, strongly urges this Commission and the Congress to support, with complete commitment, the school library instructional component as an essential section of the National Library Act.

MR. TATE: We are finished with those who pre-registered to give testimony. We will now hear from others who registered this morning. The first person is John Smith.

Statement of John Smith

MR. SMITH (through an interpreter): My name is John Smith, delegate from California. I have been working recently in the library as a deaf service specialist. I recently became an American Sign Language (ASL) teacher at a college. I am from a deaf family.

I would like to discuss library needs of the deaf and explain the structure of ASL. The greatest problem is the communication barrier in the world. Deaf people everywhere are an invisible population because of communication barriers. Communication between the deaf and the library, and the needs of the deaf, have not been met. The greatest problem is the misunderstanding about printed material and services for the deaf. Because of phonetic symbols, deaf people do not understand the written word sometimes. Another problem is the attitude toward American Sign Language. For a long time hearing people looked down on sign language, but recently attitudes have changed. Now, our language is respected as a true language, and linguistic studies have proved that it is a language of its own—a language that depends on vision more than on hearing.

There are different types of deafness. Each type has different needs and requires different services. A large percentage of deaf people depend on lip-reading; but in general, deaf people communicate through ASL and written language. Experiences have shown that library services for the deaf should be separated from library services for those with different handicaps. Those who do not separate these services often cannot understand the needs of the deaf. Until now, they have failed to ask deaf people what their needs are. They should determine what library services are relevant to the deaf. Libraries should include deaf people as workers in the library, and hearing people who know a lot about deafness and know American Sign Language, so that they can communicate easily. Library schools need to develop programs for the deaf. They need to encourage the establishment of deaf specialists or deaf paraprofessionals in the field of library sciences.

I want to see a national program similar to the program of books for the blind developed for the deaf and hearing-impaired. The program should emphasize visuality—due to the lack of written forms that can communicate easily with the deaf. It's difficult to translate from ASL to English, because words often have no equivalent in English. The two languages are different. Videotapes, made available in a central library, make it possible to share new information with the deaf. Right now, libraries don't have this service. Information about the deaf society is very limited.

Now, I'd like to talk about the structure of ASL. I'm going to sign a bit slower so you can see how it works. You can see that my interpreter is talking. She's not using American Sign Language; She's using Pidgin Sign English (PSE). That means she's changing the order of ASL words into English order. It's not the order in which I'm signing.

In communication between the deaf, it is very important to have eye contact. For example, for the word "give," the basic sign is this hand shape (indicating). If I am going to make sense, the English sentence would be, "He gives to him." But this hand shape includes that whole thing. I have set up a person here, and here (indicating). The imaginary people are here, and the movement conveys the whole meaning of the sentence: "He gives to him" or, "A person gives me a lot." The sign is repeated. It's already a full sentence, because I've moved and changed the meaning.

Facial expression, as part of the grammatical structure, is very important. Take the basic sign for "understand" (indicating). That means, "Do you understand?" With a quizzical look, it means, "I don't understand," or "Don't you understand?" Hearing people overlook this. They think it's one word, but it has different meanings. I have just made four sentences, based on facial expression.

There are two more points of grammar, the noun and verb pairs. For example, the basic sign for airplane is really a noun, because it is made quickly and repeatedly. If I use the sign once with continuous motion, it means the verb to fly. Take the example of "zipper." If I want to say it as a noun, I repeat the sign quickly. If I make the sign once, it has a different meaning. It means the verb "zip."

MR. BURNS: How many people are there with a hearing handicap in the United States? What is the proportion of the total population that has this handicap?

MR. SMITH: There is some disagreement on this point. Some say five percent; some say 10 percent. To my knowledge, 11.5 percent of the United States population have a hearing handicap.

Statement of Ivan Bender

MR. BENDER: My name is Ivan R. Bender. I serve as a consultant to the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress, with a primary responsibility for working with libraries in areas in which the copyright laws affect libraries and library usage.

A piece of the materials which the delegates and alternates received was a letter to them from the Copyright Office. I would like to read it into the record very quickly. I would be glad to answer any questions which you might have about the statement:

"On January 1, 1978, the first general revision of the United States copyright laws since 1909 became effective. The new legislation (Public Law 94-553) was widely hailed as one which brought the United States copyright laws up to date in an era of technological developments.

"One area of the new law which required careful negotiation by the various interest groups concerns reprography of all kinds as it affects libraries and library users. It is not surprising, therefore, that the interest of the Copyright Office in this Conference is quite intense. We hope that, through this paper, and discussions among staff of the Copyright Office and with persons attending the Conference, we will be able to make you aware of our concerns and that we will become more aware of yours.

"Section 108 of the Copyright Law, entitled "Limitations on Exclusive Rights: Reporduction by Libraries and Archives," is the center of our focus for the White House Conference. This provision enables libraries and their users to reproduce copies or phonorecords of certain works, under certain terms and conditions. As you might imagine, representatives of authors, and publishers of copyrighted works, as well as representatives of librarians and users of libraries, spent considerable time discussing the various issues involved and in testifying before Congress in an attempt to secure the best resolution of a difficult problem. The final language of this section of the law is a cooperative effort by those interest groups and the Congress.

"Without a doubt, a new concept of the law was being developed. No one who was involved in this effort was completely happy with the final result, which is, perhaps, the best indicator of a successful compromise. But, like all compromises, some things do not work in practice as well as they should. Therefore, Congress, aware of possible unforeseen problems, as well as having the desire to be kept apprised of developments in this area, created language which mandates that the Register of Copyrights, at five-year intervals beginning with the effective date of the law, issue a report to the Congress on this section. The first of these reports is due on January 1, 1983."

A resolution which appears on page 87 of the Conference issues booklet requests that Congress reconsider the copyright laws. I think the mandate already is built into the law by virtue of the provision to which I have just referred. This mandate specifies that the Register, after consulting with the appropriate interest groups, " . . . shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the extent to which this section (108) has achieved the intended statutory balancing of the rights of creators, and the needs of users. The report should also describe any problems that may have arisen, and present legislative or other recommendations, if warranted." It is this mandate which particularly brings us here.

At present, the Copyright Office is planning the manner in which the first report will be prepared. We have formed an Advisory Committee, consisting of 10 persons representing all the affected groups, to assist us in making certain decisions about how to conduct the survey, what kind of regional hearings we should schedule, and to help us maintain an effective liaison with the constituencies. One group whose concerns are very important is the library user who is neither a librarian nor an academician by profession. Since this Conference is largely made up of library users, it is the feeling of the Copyright Office that now is one of the best times to involve you.

Much of what you will be considering, and what you are discussing, may well affect the copyright laws. We invite you to explore this issue with the Copyright Office further, beginning with the Conference itself. I draw particular attention to the first of four regional hearings scheduled for January 19, 1980, in Chicago. They will be open hearings, will begin at 9:30 a.m., and will last all day. We hope to hear from many nonprofessional people interested in library issues, as well as librarians and others concerned with the problem presented by Section 108.

MR. BURNS: Do you view the Commission as having a role in these preliminary hearings prior to the drafting of the revisions of this current legislation?

MR. BENDER: I do. I think the Commission can help the Copyright Office to create a more effective liaison with nonprofessional people, who are concerned about what libraries do, what effect libraries have on the community, and, obviously, how the copyright laws in particular affect those issues. The work of the Commission can continue, as I said, in this capacity in particular. We hope that better liaison will be established.

MR. TATE: Next we have Alvin White.

Statement of Alvin White

MR. WHITE: I am Alvin H. White, General Secretary of the Aging World Brain Machine Neural Telecommunications Coalition Continuing Lifelong Health Legislative, Scientific and Technical Information Systems Education and Testing Research and Development Organization Planning Study. I speak today as an individual.

Healthy development of our living organizational planetary subdivisional sociopolitical body, during the aging processes, from the relatively youthful childhood times of embryonic fertilization, and the increasingly complex growth of maturing sensory telecommunicating neural information transmission systems, to the on-line memory, which, in turn, is drawn upon by the judgmental decision-making faculties, which calculate and compute rational formulae governing the allocation of time, energy and other of the body's resources, in attempting to approximate the optimum distribution for reducing the probability of suffering future pain, may, or may not, be wisely considered important in this White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Government of the body, by the body, and for the body, in healthy, long-lived, and relatively pain-free higher organisms, has been shown throughout natural history to have been substantially directed toward the development of an integrated brain and nervous system capable of increasing its sensibilities, information processing, storage, and transmission rates.

Lastly, let me say that I feel that the Conference has underemphasized the future utility of machine translation and computer speech from on-line information users of this planet's minority languages.

MR. TATE: I'd like to hear now from Mr. Theodore Soo-Hoo.

Statement of Theodore Soo-Hoo

MR. SOO-HOO: I am Theodore Soo-Hoo. I am secretary of the Tenley Library Council of Washington, D.C. I speak from experience with the public library system of Washington, D.C., but I believe that there are two fundamental gaps in many library systems.

First, people do not recognize the importance of continuing to develop their reading skill after finishing their formal education. They need to be reminded that continued selective reading is good for them, even if they are not PhD's. Even if they are PhD's, the Tenley Library Council's Friends of the Library Organization, has developed a series of posters for our "Read Your Way Up" program. We change them biweekly.

A typical poster is worded approximately as follows: "James Gavin, grade school dropout, joined the Army. At the Army post library he taught himself enough to pass the exams for West Point. He rose to the rank of Lieutenant General. When he retired, he became head of a leading research organization." Another poster, now on the library bulletin boards, says, "One man in the audience said that in spite of six years of college, he had learned more at the public library than in all his years of formal schooling."

We plan to add to the series, as we find more testimony to the benefits of reading for everyone. The posters are hand lettered and cost practically nothing. If a more effective method of promoting and encouraging reading is developed, we would like to know about it.

The second gap is access. Due to budget limitations, 16 of Washington's 20 branch libraries are open only 40 hours a week. In the summer they are closed on Saturday, leaving only two evenings per week that they are accessible to people who work in the daytime.

Contrast this with the following comment from the vice president of our Library Council, Mr. McNealy, who travels over the world to evaluate book events for the U.S. Information Agency: "I spent some time in Paris in October, and visited the finest public library I have ever seen. Would you believe 12 noon to 10 p.m. every weekday except Tuesday? Closed on Tuesday. And 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. Those are the hours. They also have a book store and print shop inside, and separate collection rooms to hear records, watch films and slide shows. It's free even to foreigners; but, of course, it helped to be able to read French."

What can NCLIS do about such mundane problems? You can encourage and promote continuing aggressive programs to encourage reading at all levels within and beyond our educational system. You can encourage all libraries to review their accessibility to the public in imaginative ways.

MR. TATE: Now, we will hear from Marilyn Apseloff.

Statement of Marilyn Apseloff

MS. APSELOFF: I am Marilyn Apseloff, a teacher of children's literature in the English Department at Kent State University. I am here as an official observer from the Children's Literature Association, and my interest is priority funding for children's services.

Although libraries are usually at the bottom of the funding pile, when money is made available to them, children's services often get short shrift. This is a plea for a change in priorities. If we want to encourage lifelong learning, if we hope to have intelligent adults who will use and love the libraries and be willing to fight for them, we must start with the child, and with those who work with the child.

More funds must be available for the purchase of children's literature, records, tapes and films. And the needs of adults concerned with children and their literature, including writers, educators, teachers at all levels, concerned parents, students, and institutions—as well as libraries—must also be met.

More funds are needed for secondary source materials, so that we can encourage scholarship and research in children's literature. Such studies will focus more attention on an area that often is deprecated or ignored. It is short-sighted for college professors, for example, to denigrate the study of children's literature and, in the next breath, to complain about their students' inability to read and to write.

The Children's Literature Association is trying to remedy the situation by disseminating information on children's literature through the Children's Literature Association Quarterly, the annual conferences, and the conference proceedings, and by working with publishers and other organizations. We have established a scholarship to help members with research, and we present an annual award for the most significant critical article written during a given year.

Libraries are crucial to meet our goals, to meet what should be the country's goals—a heightened awareness of children's literature so that we can make book lovers of children, and a determination to educate their parents and others to realize the importance of good books for children. Therefore, I urge you, on behalf of children everywhere, to keep these in the forefront of your deliberations. Our future will be in their hands.

MR. TATE: We now hear from Linette Hunter.

Statement of Linette Hunter

MS. HUNTER: I'm Linette Hunter, Director of Library Services for the Territory of American Samoa, and I represent the island communities of the United States—sometimes known as the forgotten Americans—consisting of American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Marinas, Federated States of Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

We would like the White House Conference to consider three important issues that concern us: 1) the Postal Service rates and telecommunication rates; 2) funding based on needs; and 3) the diverse cultural and ethnic collections in libraries.

We should eliminate geographical barriers to access to information. These barriers particularly affect the noncontiguous areas of the United States. The use of surface mail to deliver library books and materials and audiovisual materials causes a serious delay, often resulting in the receipt of information when it is no longer of use.

In addition, domestic telecommunication rates do not apply to noncontinguous areas of the United States. The U.S. Postal Service should change its policy, so that all library materials addressed to noncontiguous areas will be sent as airmail at surface mail rates. Federal policy regarding telecommunication rates should be revised to ensure that domestic rates apply to noncontiguous areas of the United States.

Federal grants currently are being awarded primarily on a per capita basis and many have matching grant requirements. Areas such as the noncontiguous areas of the United States and rural areas, which have low population density and low per capita income, are penalized by this policy, yet they have the greatest need for information resources. In order that all citizens will have access to information daily, the National Library Act should include special provisions for funding those areas with special needs.

Diversify cultural and ethnic collections; library collections should reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of the Nation's communities, with special emphasis on the indigenous ethnic populations of given localities. The diverse cultural heritages within this Nation should be recognized. Such a provision in our libraries would promote cultural understanding. Congress should mandate a national policy for libraries which would include a provision that all libraries, at every level, adopt such a collection priority.

MR. TATE: Margaret Stern will now speak.

Statement of Margaret Stern

MS. STERN: Cicero called the library the "soul of his house," and Pope John Paul II said, "A city needs a soul if it is to become a true home for human beings." It is my sincere hope that this Conference will devote itself to nurturing its soul. I represent the Interbranch Library Users Association, which is the umbrella group of library users in New York City.

I am also a member of the Five Borough Library Association, and we have proved in the past that we can fight city hall. This is a result of discussions with library users throughout the five boroughs. Each neighborhood has its own special needs and its own characteristics, and these are shifting constantly with shifts in population. When the 1980 census is completed, it will be apparent how wide these shifts are.

For example, there are areas that need Spanish language books. There are areas that need Chinese books. Within this library system as a whole, there are books in 74 foreign languages, and books for children in 50 languages. Now there is a need for more Asian language books. The hours are abominable. We are now 31 percent below the minimum State standards. In some areas the libraries are falling down, and problems proliferate.

We want a policy that will stress essentials. With the loss of workers paid under the Federal Comprehensive Employment Training Act, we are in worse straits than ever. This is something that Congress should see to. We want a policy that will enable our libraries, like our national forests, to remain forever free.

We want a policy that will stress essentials to develop a book-oriented public—a public that can understand what is happening in today's changing world and can tell our legislators what they want and need.

In the Borough of Manhattan, which serves a population of three-and-a-quarter million people, individuals borrowed 9.164 million books last year, an increase of more than 136,000 books.

Milton said, "A good book is the precious life force of a master spirit." Let me end by quoting President Carter in his pre-election statement about libraries: "If we are to have an educated and informed population, we need a strong and open library system, supported by a committed Administration. We cannot call for a revival of quality education, and close our libraries. We cannot ask our children to learn to read, if we take away their books."

MR. TATE: We thank those who made presentations before members of this panel, and we thank all persons who have served as panelists for their efforts, their time, and their questions. We again thank the members of the staff who helped to plan this program so that you could participate.

This session has been stimulating. It certainly has been informative, and it has allowed us to know the different facets and aspects of library work that are dear to other people.

Libraries are important. Dr. Burke said to me last night as we looked at the ceiling in the Library of Congress building, "If we could get people to build buildings in these days as they built them years ago, with all of the artistry and all of the quotations that we see around the wall, then we could certainly have people of the various communities throughout the States understand just how dear libraries are to our society—and, of course, how important they are to the intellectuality of our society."

(Whereupon, the session adjourned at 11:40 a.m.)

Open Hearing III

Panel Members

William J. Welsh, Chairperson
Joseph Becker
Clara S. Jones
Marian P. Leith
John E. Velde, Jr.

Testimony By:

Saturday, November 17, 1979

	PAGE
Jule Shipman	406
William J. LeVeque	407
Whitney North Seymour, Jr.	409
Alex Ladenson	412
Robert L. Clark, Jr.	414
Thomas Galvin	417
Cheryl Marshall	419
Thomas Battle	421
Rt. Rev. Edward Murray	424
Sandra Ferguson	426
James Dillon	428
Elaine Layne	430
Albert Herling	432
Tryntje Van Ness Seymour	433
Marjorie Stern	435
Patricia Klinck	436
Paxton Price	438
Robert Asleson	440
Lotsee Smith	442
Miv Schaaf	443
Marlene Halverson	445
Frank Mevers	446

Proceedings

MR. WELSH: This hearing is being conducted by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) as part of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services in an effort to ensure that the Conference is a grassroots effort—that all who wish to be heard, are heard. Each witness has been asked to register and to submit an abstract and the full text of his or her statement. This testimony will form part of the official written record of the Conference.

Those who do not have an opportunity to testify are encouraged to submit written statements. The record will remain open until December 3, and any testimony received before then will be included in the final official record.

I'm Bill Welsh and I'm joined by Joe Becker, Marian Leith, Clara Jones, and Bud Velde.

Our first witness is Jule Shipman, Pennsylvania Citizens for Better Libraries, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Statement of Jule Shipman

MS. SHIPMAN: I am Jule Shipman, President of Pennsylvania Citizens for Better Libraries, and a member of the Pennsylvania delegation to the White House Conference. I have been asked by our delegation to present the attached resolution, which it approved on October 17, 1979, for submission to the Conference. It is the culmination of increasing concern in Pennsylvania about the issue of library and information service support. From the centers of our major cities to the sparsely populated rural areas of our State, we hear the same appeal: Give us the services we need to help us help ourselves. Keep our libraries open now, when we most need them. The common voice of 600 Pennsylvanians at our Governor's Conference accordingly placed first priority on this issue.

The first order of business of our delegation was to create a statewide Friends of the Library group to carry this issue to the State Capitol. Thus, we viewed with increasing concern the literature coming to us on Conference preparations that ambitiously dealt with substantive questions of library programs and technology, but lost sight of the most significant challenge to libraries in this century—that is, their place in the funding priorities of a society beset by inflation. Also, without positive focus on funding, we deeply feared a rudderless ship of high intentions that would fail to reach any port of achievement. We thus welcomed the initiative of the Kennedy-Javits Bill (S.B. 1124) as a framework for productive discussion. We recognize it as a study bill—a vehicle for the development of organized solutions to the pressing problem of future library and information service support.

We further welcome Maryland's invitation to each of the 58 White House Conference delegations to caucus this week on Conference follow-through. A national oversight committee that represents the Conference is essential, if we are to carry the spirit of the Conference effectively into the future provision of national library legislation and any other important implementation of Conference principles.

In the excitement of Conference dialog on its admittedly vital themes, the Pennsylvania delegation offers this resolution with the hope that the Conference will formally adopt it as an affirmation of practical need. Library and information service programs need a home. The home needs a foundation. The foundation needs a builder. They all need maintenance. As we dream for the future, let's not forget how to realize these dreams.

ADDENDUM:

Proposed Resolution

Be it resolved, 1) that the White House Conference recognize the urgent need for a reordering of local, State, and Federal priorities to respond to the increasing need for excellence and wide use of library and information services; 2) that such reordering result in improved funding for all types of nonprofit library and information services, with significantly heavier shares borne by State and Federal governments; 3) that S.B. 1124 be developed into a strong national library act giving impetus and sustenance to this reordering of priorities and reallocation of resources, and providing substantial response to the major specific library and information service needs which may be subject to Federal intervention; 4) that a structure of responsibility be confirmed by the Conference for effective follow-through with this development.

MR. WELSH: I have one question. In the second resolution, you say, "for all types of nonprofit library and information services." Has this been approved in any way by any of the other organizations, for example, the Research Library Group, or any of the groups that are not part of the original legislation?

MS. SHIPMAN: We have not formally sought such approval.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is William J. LeVeque, Rhode Island delegation.

Statement of William J. LeVeque

MR. LEVEQUE: I'm William J. LeVeque, citizen delegate from Rhode Island. The Rhode Island delegation strongly supports Federal legislation which will assist in the development of library and information services in the United States. Today, I present the views of the Rhode Island delegation on the National Library Act—S.B. 1124.

If the existence of a free and democratic society in this country is to be guaranteed, it must be the policy of the United States to establish, support, and expand educational opportunities for individuals of all ages. Individuals must be guaranteed equal access to public information. This guarantee must be maintained at all levels of government to be fully realized. At the same time, it is important to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of the State and local governments in conducting library services will not be infringed.

Turning to specific titles of the bill, the Rhode Island delegation recommends that Title I, establishing a national library agency, and Title V, on interlibrary cooperation, be removed from this bill and considered as a separate entity. As described in the bill, the national library agency is responsible for furthering cooperation among all kinds of libraries, while the next three titles of the bill would give it an additional role as funding agency for the public libraries alone. Whether the agency should be the funding mechanism for all kinds of libraries, or whether this function should be left to the Office of Library and Learning Resources, is a question on which the Rhode Island delegates do not agree. What is clear is that an entirely new kind of Federal effort is urgently needed to exploit recent developments in technology which make possible radically different kinds of information storage, retrieval, and dissemination without reference to geographical or political boundaries. This should be the central function of the agency. The agency should also be funded to aid in the preservation of library materials.

Another point needs to be made about the agency. The Rhode Island Governor's Conference adopted a resolution which called for the establishment at the Federal level of a Department of Education which would include a strong Office of Libraries and Learning Resources. It is essential that the national library agency be located within the Department of Education, to establish and maintain a close relationship with the other elements of the educational community which have a bearing on library and information services. For example, Vocational Educational Act funds have been used by libraries to establish job information and career counseling programs similar to those enumerated in Title IV of S.B. 1124. It would be beneficial to have any agency that administers library funds close, both physically and administratively, to those agencies that administer education funds.

In any deliberations on the establishment of a national library agency, the Rhode Island delegation strongly recommends that careful consideration be given to the question of whether or not all agencies that provide direct library service, such as the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine, should also be administered by the national library agency. Consideration of this is vital, since these agencies undoubtedly would play an integral role in a national network.

Concerning Title II, the Rhode Island delegation strongly supports increased State/Federal funding for public libraries. Title III, funding for public library construction, is essential, especially if public libraries are to be accessible to the handicapped, and if they are to be energy-efficient. There is a provision for public library construction in the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) but that title has not been funded for some time. It is essential that funds be appropriated in the future, whether it be through LSCA or a national library act. The Rhode Island delegation also recommends that the requirement be included in S.B. 1124 that States match Federal grants for construction. Rhode Island has such a program in which the State, over the past 15 years, has committed more than $3 million to assist public libraries with their construction projects.

Funding for grants enumerated in Title IV is supported by the Rhode Island delegation. The facts and activities designated as areas for funding are critical to many citizens of this country. Library demonstration projects have shown that libraries may be less threatening environments for adult literacy and job information or career counseling activities than other educational institutions. Services to the blind and mentally and physically handicapped have been funded under LSCA, and have grown significantly. Many users still need to be reached, and funding is needed to continue these activities.

The Rhode Island delegation strongly supports interlibrary cooperation. Title V is the key area of S.B. 1124. It can serve as the foundation for a truly comprehensive network. It is recommended, once again, that serious consideration be given to the strong involvement of such Federal agencies as the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine, which provide direct library services. Without such involvement, a comprehensive network cannot be a reality.

MR. WELSH: What role in the development of a comprehensive national network would you see for existing networks, such as OCLC and RLG?

MR. LEVEQUE: We see them as the foundation of the entire network. What is needed now is Federal capital for the entire undertaking, involving the private sector to the maximum extent possible; but making available funding, impetus, and initiatives at the Federal level would enable a greater exploitation of the technological capabilities than we now have.

MR. WELSH: Would you actually foresee policy being dictated to OCLC and to RLG?

MR. LEVEQUE: I suppose that, in the usual fashion, there would be pressures brought to bear in private industry—carrots and sticks. Possibly a regulatory agency would be needed, but I don't see that it's needed at present.

MR. WELSH: It's fairly obvious that the strength of OCLC has come from its success, and has been without Federal involvement. I suppose I would have to express some concern that policy dictated at the Federal level might, in some way, impinge upon the great work that's been done.

MR. LEVEQUE: The wording in Title I of the study bill was that the national library agency should further cooperation among libraries of the country of all types. I think that's what the Rhode Island delegation would do.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Whitney North Seymour, Jr.

Statement of Whitney North Seymour, Jr.

MR. SEYMOUR: We were warned many years ago that if we came to depend on Washington to tell us when to sow and when to reap, we soon would be without bread. The author of the warning was in a good position to give us advice about government—Thomas Jefferson. Two centuries later, the advice is still sound, and nowhere is it more applicable than in the case of public libraries.

The free public library has grown up as a uniquely American institution. It was created, nurtured, and supported by local citizens and local units of government. Library boards and librarians are often cantankerous, belligerent, pigheaded, outspoken—and so are its users. But, exactly for this reason, a local public library is a bastion of liberty in the truest sense of the word. It has nurtured independent spirits like Harry Truman, whose entire education consisted of reading every book in his local library. It has contributed to books of protest which have changed the course of the Nation, books like Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*. It has stimulated great discoveries in science, including space technology. It has generated ideas, research, dissent, opposition—and, most of all, free speech and a free press. That is because librarians and trustees have been independent "cusses," who do what they perceive as right in choosing materials and in building collections, without interference from State and Federal officials.

I am a strong advocate of a new national library act. Like many other citizens, I fervently believe that libraries should receive a fair share of the taxes we send to Washington and to the State capitals. But I also share the concern that money for basic library operations must not come with any Federal or State strings on how it is to be spent. When it comes to making final decisions on the governance of the administrative structure under the proposed National Library Act, we must keep two principles clearly in mind.

First, the chief Federal administrator must be kept under tight statutory reins when it comes to approving payments of per capita matching funds under Title II for general library operations. This person should not be vested with broad discretion to approve or disapprove State plans in light of how the local libraries plan to spend the money they receive. That is the local libraries' decision to make, and theirs alone.

Second, the operations of the national library agency in other fields, such as networking and special services, should be subject to strong involvement and guidance from an appointed, nonpolitical group of independent citizens and professionals, who are primarily concerned with the strength and vitality of libraries, rather than the strength and vitality of the Administration in power. The national library program must never become a vehicle for pork-barreling or payment for political favors.

Whatever form the final national library act takes, these two guiding principles must be uppermost in the minds of the draftsmen, to ensure the continued freedom of the free public libraries of America.

MR. WELSH: You just read the statement: "The operations of a national library agency in other fields, such as networking and special services, should be subject to strong involvement and guidance." What form of guidance? Could you clarify that term for us, please?

MR. SEYMOUR: The provision of the draft bill that calls for a national council was the result of discussions with representatives of a number of the professional library groups at a meeting held in Senate offices in February. Essentially, the concerns they expressed were that policymaking for the national support services for public libraries had to come from professionals and independent citizens, not from government. There were suggestions of a structure parallel to the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Science Foundation, and the like, where knowledgeable people from the field give advice to the administrator on the best way to implement the programs. That method also provides bridges to the communities that are being served.

MR. WELSH: But would you have this agency dictate policy to the existing networks?

MR. SEYMOUR: Oh, no. Plainly, it's still a free country, and the networks may or may not join the system. I'm very conscious that the network the New York Public Library has been engaged in, for example, is terribly proud of its independence, and I think it will have to consider carefully whether it wants to participate. If it does, it obviously will have to be compensated for its contribution; but there's also great health in its maintaining its independence, if it wants to.

MR. WELSH: Would you impose standards on the networks to ensure that the product and services they provide are the types that are needed by and most useful to the libraries they serve?

MR. SEYMOUR: I think it's the other way around. They really have set standards that the Nation should aspire to—excellence in the very best sense of the word. It's the Nation that is going to draw on those lessons and benefit from them. Obviously, if such a network were to participate in a national network, it would set the conditions under which it would be willing to do so. The Federal agency would say what it wanted, and if they didn't agree, they both would go their separate ways. If they did agree, it would be as a result of free, arms-length negotiations. Nobody is going to impose anything on anybody, I hope.

MS. LEITH: Mr. Seymour, do you not feel that there is some validity in using Federal funds to upgrade library services? I read from your statement: "This person should not be vested with broad discretion to approve or disapprove State plans in light of how the local libraries plan to spend the money they recieve. That is their decision to make, and theirs alone." Are you saying that if a library wants to spend all of its money building up a local history or genealogy collection, that there should be no interference with that use of the Federal money? They should just be allowed not to serve in any other way?

MR. SEYMOUR: I would think that such a library would have a hard time persuading the State agency, which had to submit the State plan, that such a project was an adequate provision of public library services. Therefore, that library might not qualify for aid. Once the decision is made that they qualify, however, I submit very strongly that there should not be any dictating from Washington to a library that, "you may buy this book but not that book." This is absolutely fundamental, and the moment the Government can give that kind of instruction is the moment the free library system in America begins to end.

MR. BECKER: Our colleague from Rhode Island, who gave testimony a few moments ago, suggested that a national library act should embrace more than just the public libraries of the country. How do you feel about that?

MR. SEYMOUR: I was in on the early discussions on this bill, and the first outline did include the academic and the school libraries. But the professionals, to whom we citizens turn for guidance, said, "Don't do that. The academic libraries and the school libraries don't want you to rock the boat, and all you will do is destroy help for the public library." Now, the moment they come around to what I think is a much more sensible approach, I'm going to be the first to embrace them.

MR. BECKER: The alternative, of course, is for each of them to submit an Act responsible for meeting their own needs.

MR. SEYMOUR: They each have an Act. That's the point. Of course, don't overlook the fact that this bill does have provisions in it for direct Federal grants to research, private, school, and other libraries that make their resources available to the public library users.

MS. JONES: When a group of citizens is planning to go forward with legislation that is favorable to libraries, you naturally look backward to get the historical context. I know that you have been associated with this National Library Act, and you have given it a great deal of thought. How do you see this in the context of progress that the library profession has made in securing legislation and agencies, and everything that has gone into progress for libraries?

MR. SEYMOUR: I say, with deep emotional commitment, that we're on the threshold of an entirely new era for the public library in America. It's no longer purely a local institution. It is now recognized as the national asset that it is.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Alex Ladenson.

Statement of Alex Ladenson

MR. LADENSON: I'm Alex Ladenson, legal counsel to the Urban Libraries Council. Within the recent past, I have been the chief librarian of the Chicago Public Library. The purpose of my testimony is to attempt to demonstrate what is wrong with the existing Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA).

Since its enactment in 1964, LSCA has been administered as a categorical grants-in-aid program, with the result that the funds are used almost exclusively for research, experimentation, and demonstration. This format for the distribution of funds remains unchanged. The program operates in a manner not unlike a private foundation. To obtain funds, a public library must submit a proposal describing a project. Unless a given project is innovative or experimental, it has little or no chance for approval. Moreover, a project is approved for a relatively short time, and usually is not renewable. If the project is successful, the library is compelled to carry it on with the library's own funds, or to abandon it. Thus, much of the value to be gained from the project is lost. What is critically needed today, however, are not research, experimental or demonstration projects, but additional funds for books and other library materials and for staff, so that the public can be served.

LSCA needs to be thoroughly overhauled and cast in a different mold. Instead of providing a categorical grants-in-aid program, it should be a per capita general support program. Federal assistance must be made available to all public libraries, rather than to just a selective few, as is the case today.

Public libraries depend largely on the local property tax for their financial support. The property tax is a regressive tax, but its most serious weakness is that it lacks elasticity. Unlike the income tax or the sales tax, which generate additional revenue automatically as wages and prices rise, revenue from the property tax remains relatively constant, and it increases only slightly as the total assessed valuation of property rises. This is particularly disastrous in periods of high inflation. It is for this reason that the Federal Government must share with local and State governments the responsibility for direct financial support of public libraries.

Direct Federal assistance to all public libraries is essential to equalize disparities in the amount of taxable wealth among the States. Thus, Federal support can help to guarantee the minimum level of funding required to furnish adequate public library service in every State.

We have become a mobile Nation. More than a million persons move from one State to another each year. It is highly desirable, therefore, from a social point of view, that the quality of public library service be equalized among the States, so that an individual is not penalized when moving from one State to another. The quality of public library service should not depend on where a person is born or happens to live. Through direct Federal aid, this problem can be alleviated.

The principal objective of Federal aid must be the strengthening of *every* public library in the country, for it is the local library that serves as the first port of entry for those seeking general information or needing to explore a subject in depth. Federal funds should therefore be available for this vital purpose. To achieve this objective, the categorical grants-in-aid design must be replaced by the per capita general support grant.

This is why S.B. 1124, a bill for a National Library Act, should be approved, since it incorporates the per capita general support grant in its provisions.

MR. WELSH: I judge that you are absolutely convinced that new Federal legislative proposals are much more important than funding existing programs.

MR. LADENSON: I don't quite understand what you mean by "existing programs."

MR. WELSH: The legislation that we now have to help libraries of all kinds could be made more effective if more dollars were made available; but you consider that to be secondary. You think that a new approach to Federal support for libraries is important?

MR. LADENSON: When you make the money available directly to the public libraries, you are improving the programs for better library service in each community. What we oppose is the rediscovery of the wheel by making grants available for experimentation and research that's done over and over again. This is where a good part of our current money goes. We need it far more for books and for staff.

MS. LEITH: I notice that you say "direct Federal assistance is going to equalize disparities in the amount of taxable wealth." Do I understand, then, that a poor State would be given more Federal money per capita for its population than a wealthy State?

MR. LADENSON: As far as the formula for the distribution of funds from the Federal Government to the States, we are not recommending any change. And the present formula takes into consideration the per capita income of each State; those States that have a lower per capita income are getting more money from the Federal Government than the richer States. I would certainly endorse that concept, and we're not changing that.

MR. BECKER: Alternatives to the provision by the Federal Government of money to the local level, along the lines that you have described, are some innovative ideas that concern resource-sharing as a means of doing exactly what you describe. How do you view this suggestion as an alternative? And what kind of support do you think the Federal Government should give to resource-sharing?

MR. LADENSON: The National Library Act has a provision for funds for special users and special projects, and that's where the money should come from. The largest portion of the pie should be in Title II, that's for direct grants to libraries for operating purposes. What's left over—if there is money left over, and if there is sufficient money in the Federal treasury—can be made available under Title IV. There's still a possibility for important special projects, for special users. The new National Library Act makes provision for that, but we don't think it's wise to spend all of our money on research.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Robert L. Clark, Jr.

Statement of Robert L. Clark, Jr.

MR. CLARK: I represent the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA). I have a statement on S.B. 1124. COSLA supports Federal legislation which would assist in the development of library services throughout the Nation. Each level of government has appropriate roles and responsibilities which complement one another. Each level must provide strong leadership in the development of library and information services.

COSLA has prepared and disseminated a COSLA Legislative Proposal, adopted April 5, 1979. Subsequent to the development of the COSLA Proposal, S.B. 1124 was introduced in Congress for study purposes at this Conference. The bill addresses several of the concerns included in COSLA's Proposal. These concerns are as follows:

We support the "Declaration of Policy and Purpose" of S.B. 1124, but believe additional study is needed on the nature and structure of another national library agency before endorsement.

We support increases in both State and Federal assistance for public libraries, but call attention to problems involved in Congressional mandate for a 20/30/50 formula, as proposed in Title II of the bill. Based upon the experience of the States in working with sometimes inflexible per capita standards which do not adequately recognize local or regional differences, we do not support the proposal for a national per capita standard.

We support increased Federal assistance for interlibrary cooperation as proposed in the bill. The bill recognizes the Federal nature of our Government, and enables the States to contract for multi-State services for the best benefits of their citizens.

We support Federal assistance for the construction of public library buildings, and recommend analysis and clarification of the proposed formula for allocation of funds to the States.

We endorse the principle of the distribution of Federal assistance to public libraries by the State, in accord with the needs as determined within the States.

We support the requirement that the States increase their share of public library support as a matching requirement for Federal assistance.

We support Federal assistance for specially designed public library services and resources for special clientele.

We endorse Federal assistance for the training and continuing education needs of library personnel.

We support the use of Federal funds for statewide services, when these services can be most beneficially delivered from this level.

MR. WELSH: You're aware that the Library of Congress has invited your group to come to the Library in the Spring to discuss how we might manage the problem of greater control of State and local publications. Would you prefer to be invited by a national library agency or directed by a national library agency?

MR. CLARK: I would prefer to hold a national forum to discuss the question and study it further. We favor whatever is needed in the way of a national meeting to discuss national issues. S.B. 1124 should get immediate study during the Congressional hearing process. These concerns should be addressed at the national level through the legislative process. We hope that these concerns are addressed with deliberate speed, but we urge that Congress act on the comments that COSLA has made. We need a national information policy, and we don't have one yet.

MR. WELSH: As the Deputy Librarian of Congress, did I interpret that to be a "no" answer?

MR. CLARK: It was my opportunity to finish my paper.

MS. LEITH: Do COSLA members envision States losing their Federal money because the State will refuse to accelerate its support and allow the localities to reduce theirs immediately?

MR. CLARK: There needs to be further clarification of how the formula in the national minimum per capita is to be applied in the allocation of funds to the States. COSLA does not support the 20/30/50 funding ratio; we do not support it based on a national minimum per capita. What we do have is the ability for State agencies to deliver the funds on a direct per capita basis, which many States are doing, or to provide statewide services such as film cooperatives and the children's summer reading programs with Federal dollars. COSLA's members wish to retain the right to determine what is best for each individual of the State in line with their State plan. It's not clear, at this time, how the money is allocated.

MR. BECKER: Do you feel that the money should have no strings attached? Each of the States at present has a carefully worked out plan, based on a great deal of analysis. Do you suggest that the money go directly down to the local level, with no control whatsoever?

MR. CLARK: I do not agree with that. The bill, as it's presently written, does allow for the State plans to be submitted. It does allow for the States to determine the needs within their own plans and the money to be spent on a per capita basis, as far as is practicable, which is what many States are doing. Right now, the bill does allow for the State prerogative.

MR. BECKER: Certainly there will be outcomes from this Conference that we cannot foresee, but what do you see as the relationship between those outcomes and the testimony before the Congress on S.B. 1124.

MR. CLARK: That's like forecasting the future. The results of this Conference, and the Congressional hearings that most likely will occur in the next several months, will have a very direct effect on the future national information policy. S.B. 1124 has the potential to be a comprehensive national library act. We should not lose opportunities to move on it.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Thomas Galvin.

Statement of Thomas J. Galvin

MR. GALVIN: I am Thomas Galvin, at-large delegate to the Conference representing the American Library Association (ALA). With me is Eileen Cooke, director of the ALA Washington Office. The delegates to this Conference have an opportunity to help determine the place of libraries in an information society. Our libraries, many of which are now in serious financial peril, are a national resource that America must save and strengthen.

The Federal Government has a continuing responsibility for the quality of library and information services available to all Americans. In establishing NCLIS, Congress recognized that responsibility. In a message to Congress on October 31, 1979, President Carter set forth a broad Government program to spur industrial innovation in America. With Federal assistance, libraries could help to achieve this and other national goals, such as disseminating information on energy conservation, reducing adult illiteracy, providing essential societal information to the disadvantaged, the elderly, and the handicapped, and ensuring a quality education for the young.

One major proposal concerning the Federal role in support of libraries is S.B. 1124, the National Library Act. This study bill has a number of interesting, significant, and important aspects that merit thoughtful consideration and exploration. It suggests the creation of a new national library agency. However, subsequent to the introduction of this Bill, the Government established the Department of Education. This new department provides a new and timely opportunity for a locus of Federal responsibility and demonstrates, as well, how difficult it is to create a new bureaucracy.

The Department of Education offers an immediate opportunity for a strengthened administrative unit for Federal library programs. Some functions envisioned for the proposed national library agency could be handled very effectively by an expanded Office of Libraries and Learning Resources at the Assistant Secretary level within the new department. A proposed resolution to this effect is attached to my statement for consideration by the delegates to this Conference.

Under the time constraints of a White House Conference, delegates will not be able to work out all the detailed issues raised by S.B. 1124. ALA recommends that all interested parties should work out specific provisions for implementing legislation after the Conference, based on the priorities set and the directions recommended by the delegates. NCLIS could hold an open forum on the implementation issues of the National Library Act or other legislative proposals recommended by Conference delegates. Meanwhile, the importance of a strong expression of support by

Conference delegates for increased funding for existing library programs cannot be overemphasized.

The President's FY 1981 budget, now being developed by the Office of Management and Budget, is expected to contain sharp reductions in library funding. The school library programs would be cut in half. Library training and demonstration would have zero funding.

New legislative initiatives should be anticipated by increasing the funding for existing programs so that there will be money to transfer to new programs which may be recommended at this Conference. A proposed resolution on funding of current Federal library programs is attached to my statement, along with several others that we suggest as timely and appropriate. We hope that all of these draft resolutions can be considered by the delegates. We thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of ALA.

MR. WELSH: Do I interpret your remark to suggest that the White House Conference should focus on the issues that are before Congress now, rather than on any new legislative proposal?

MR. GALVIN: It is indeed my feeling that priority attention should go to issues that are now before the Congress in legislation. In particular, we hope that attention can be given to the proposed National Periodical Center, which is currently before the Congress as part of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. There is a resolution appended to my statement that relates to the National Periodical Center. We hope the delegates to this Conference will endorse it.

MR. WELSH: Is your principal reason for reacting that way because you feel that we need considerably more time to study the issues that are before us in S.B. 1124?

MR. GALVIN: Yes, it is. I think there are some very complex and subtle concepts in that legislation that, particularly as they relate to the machinery rather than the objectives, will need thoughtful consideration and exploration by the library community, and by all of those who are concerned with libraries.

MR. BECKER: In some of your writings, you talked about a need for a national information policy. Some people have mentioned that phrase earlier today. There has been a lot of discussion about the partnership between the public and the private sector in developing library and information services. Yet no legislative proposals discussed thus far have talked about the Federal relationship to the private sector, to make sure that these two interests move in harmony. Have you any ideas along those lines?

MR. GALVIN: To meet America's information needs, we need to draw on all of the resources of the total information community, of which libraries are, of course, a key element. NCLIS, again, in its leadership role, has taken a very important step in creating a

Public/Private Sector Task Force, on which I serve. This task force is beginning to address this critical and complex set of issues. I think these issues have not been sufficiently discussed in the library and information communities.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Cheryl Marshall.

Statement of Cheryl Marshall

MS. MARSHALL: My name is Cheryl Marshall. I am a staff member of the Montclair (New Jersey) Public Library. I have had a unique opportunity to study the role of information and referral services as they relate to public libraries. While information deprivation knows no socio-economic or geographical boundaries, it is the poor and disadvantaged on whom this deprivation has its major effect. The disadvantaged tend to be older, undereducated, unskilled, unemployed, and poor. Sixteen percent of the white population are in this category, 44 percent of the black population, and 56 percent of those with Spanish surnames. More than 23 million adult Americans—one in five—lack even the rudimentary skills to cope in today's society. They are unable to fill out forms, write checks, dial phones, or understand help wanted ads.

In addition, America's poor and disadvantaged people perceive themselves as being surrounded by institutions which have little relevance to their problems, needs and lifestyles. We all know that which is perceived, whether fiction or fact, becomes an individual's truth. As socially responsible librarians begin to realize this, many libraries have made dramatic attempts to alter their apathetic stance. Literacy programs are beginning. Cultural and language barriers are being torn down through the use of indigenous library assistants and paraprofessionals, and with programs tailored to meet the particular need of the community in which the library exists.

In New York City's South Bronx, where 200,000 Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking people are concentrated, the key to effective service has been the use of a community liaison, a Spanish-speaking nonlibrarian who serves as a strong connecting link between the neighborhood and each of the nine branch libraries serving the area. When people started coming into the libraries in the South Bronx in response to this program, the majority of their inquiries concerned coping with their day-to-day existence. Queries regarding housing, health services, educational opportunities, and consumer goods and services point to the need for a major expansion of a library's informational role, and increased responsiveness to those segments of the society which are now underserved.

Since many urgent information needs cannot be met by relying solely on traditional library resources, the library must supplement present efforts by serving as an intermediary between the community and a broad spectrum of resources, people, agencies—in a nutshell, information and referral services. Information and referral services are fairly new to the public library landscape, but they are rapidly becoming a standard service in every region of the United States from Wake County, North Carolina, to Chicago, to Houston. Their purpose is to link an individual with the service, activity, information, or advice that fits his or her need.

Libraries can no longer afford to be simply book warehouses. Librarians are trained to acquire, classify, and disseminate information, but must also learn to assist patrons in getting food stamps or financial assistance for college education. A man in his mid-forties who wants to learn to read and write should be just as comfortable in his public library as a doctoral student. By indexing their community's governmental, cultural, and social services, the library gains a unique overview of community facilities. This knowledge has allowed the library, in some instances, to bring about needed change. Ironically, such information services in public libraries have proven so effective that as many as 50 percent of the inquiries come from agencies seeking information regarding services provided by other agencies. A variety of techniques must be utilized to uncover the full knowledge of community resources. Through interaction with churches, community action groups, bars, and barber shops, many public libraries have become a part of an informal community network.

MR. WELSH: We all support the views that you have expressed. However, how do you think that the national library act will provide services to the disadvantaged and to the poor that are not possible under existing legislation. What special features of the bill that is being considered are not already funded or covered in existing legislation?

MS. MARSHALL: To my knowledge, the funds that have been available to public libraries to perform these kinds of services always have been on a limited basis. What I hope a national library act would do is help all libraries set the same kind of standards and get the same kind of services. On a national level, it would broaden an information data base so that people would have access to relevant information across the country.

MR. WELSH: But couldn't we do this now, if we had adequate funding under existing legislation?

MS. MARSHALL: Not unless I'm not familiar enough with the existing legislation. As far as I know, and in my experience, LSCA monies that were available to us were only for a limited time, and we had to cut back services drastically because the money just wasn't there. It takes more than three years to tailor the service to a particular community, because, I think, the first two or three years are simply spent gaining experience. If I had had three more years, I could have done a better job than I did in the first three.

MS. LEITH: Why do you think that this type of funding under the National Library Act is going to help you, when the new Act is for direct operating costs which, of course, are skyrocketing. I believe that the emphasis on outreach and information and referral would be diminished, rather than increased. Is this not your idea of the Act?

MS. MARSHALL: No, it's not my idea of the Act. I feel very differently. I think that outreach traditionally has been viewed as a service that is solely for disadvantaged, or something to be used whenever nothing else will do. My position on outreach, information and referral included, is that anything you do outside of the library walls is outreach.

MR. BECKER: We've seen, you've described, and my colleague, Clara Jones, has proven what can happen even under the present circumstances in promoting new services like information and referral, which have been so successful wherever they've been tried. Surely, there must be other services that we've wanted to introduce. One suggestion has been that the library become a place where people learn to read. Do you have additional ideas, beyond information and referral, that you feel the Federal Government should support?

MS. MARSHALL: Yes, many.

MS. JONES: Would passage of the National Library Act encompass LSCA, or would LSCA continue to exist along with the National Library Act?

MS. MARSHALL: It is my understanding that it will not encompass LSCA.

MR. LADENSON: S.B. 1124 repeals the LSCA, but it actually has incorporated most of the mechanics of it.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Thomas C. Battle.

Statement of Thomas C. Battle

MR. BATTLE: My name is Thomas Battle. I'm acting director of the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center at Howard University, Washington, D.C. I want to talk about the importance of public libraries, and the availability of meaningful public library services, to America's minority groups—not the waves of immigrants who flooded to our shores in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, but the offspring of immigrants who were brought here in chains or in poverty, who want to learn and understand the values of our society and the roles they can play within our society. These are the minorities of America who traditionally have suffered from illiteracy, high unemployment, and inability to speak English, or to command it well.

More than 200 years have passed since Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues at Philadelphia asserted as a self-evident truth that "all men are created equal." While this equality has not been realized effectively, its vigorous pursuit continues. Ironically, our computer-based, highly industrialized society, and increasingly benevolent Government have made equality harder to achieve for many citizens than it was for most in the simpler setting of the 18th Century. To realize "equal opportunity" in present-day America, one needs to be able to find out where the opportunities are, and be able to utilize them to the best advantage. This often demands more knowledge, skills, and sophistication than some of our most educated citizens possessed two centuries ago.

A number of government and private programs have attempted to bridge the gap between the "advantaged" and the "disadvantaged." Few have succeeded. The result is that countless Americans live in worlds of ignorance and poverty.

The public library offers an avenue for compensatory education and for academic reinforcement. Just as the college or university library must provide curriculum support to maximize the effectiveness of the educational process, so too must public libraries support public education efforts. In this way, it truly becomes the university of the people and for the people who need it most—the educationally disadvantaged and impoverished.

While public libraries do not possess any panacea for the paradox of greater inequality today than earlier in our history, they do provide some powerful weapons for dealing with it. With their decentralized network of branches to serve local communities, with librarians professionally trained in the skills of organizing and maintaining reference materials, and with already established collections of backup resources, public libraries are the logical community agencies to provide across-the-board information and referral services, as well as support for literacy programs. The thousands of public libraries across the Nation are the logical resources to bring to bear on the task of correcting educational inequality and improving job and social skills.

Public libraries can supply needed information, improve literacy, provide guidance, and heighten self-assurance to those who are at the bottom of the economic and educational ladder. Innovative librarians and creative community leaders have already shown the way. The challenge for the rest of us is to fashion a lasting program. The thought that libraries are frills, and the failure to provide library services to our citizens in a meaningful way, are indictments of our society.

The problem is that traditional library services tend to reach only the better educated and more stable members of minority communities. For all practical purposes, these services are largely unavailable to the majority of residents of underprivileged areas.

During legalized segregation, there was no dual library system provided for the needs of blacks. Libraries often have been located in areas inaccessible to blacks and other minorities, with materials often irrelevant to the needs of these user groups. Libraries have found that, if they are to reach the disadvantaged members of their communities, they must use their resources in innovative ways. Language barriers, cultural barriers, low reading levels, and simple mistrust prevent many poverty-area people from recognizing the library as a resource capable of boosting them to jobs and a better life.

While we must provide opportunities for the institutionalized, the economically and educationally disadvantaged, it is not fair to place the financial burdens of developing and using new library resources to help these disadvantaged, primarily on the taxpayers of the community where chance has brought the need. The cost should be borne by a broader base. That is why we urgently need a new national library act, and need it funded as soon as possible.

The Javits-Kennedy Study Bill for the proposed new National Library Act provides for special library services to the illiterate, unemployed, disabled, handicapped, and institutionalized—those who most need the services.

MR. WELSH: Wouldn't it follow from your testimony that you are arguing for expansion of the National Library Act to cover the universities as well? Shouldn't Howard and other universities also be funded?

MR. BATTLE: The major problem that I see is that public library services have been curtailed to a great extent because of a lack of resources brought about by the fiscal difficulties of the Nation in general. I think this bill, or some other bill which may be prepared, which provides particularly for the operating expenses to keep these libraries open is what we need now. Universities, of course, will have to develop their own programs as they are needed.

MR. WELSH: But isn't it true that the universities face some of the same problems as the public libraries?

MR. BATTLE: They face them, but I don't necessarily think that it is the responsibility of the Government to support all university activities in the same way that it should support the activities of the public library. I think that the public library is public in more than one sense of the word.

MR. BECKER: You mentioned earlier that a number of national polls would show that libraries are an underutilized resource. You mentioned that many people don't recognize the potential that exists in public libraries for education, self-education, and enrichment. What can we do to bring these two interests closer together?

MR. BATTLE: First, of course, we have to realize that many individuals do not understand or appreciate that the library is there to offer them a service. Many individuals do not have that appreciation because of traditional factors. I think that the public libraries themselves should take the initiative in identifying the target areas which must be served and make the effort to reach these groups, rather than wait for these groups to come to them.

MR. WELSH: Our next witness is Monsignor Murray.

Statement of the Right Reverend Edward G. Murray

MSGR. MURRAY: I am Father Edward G. Murray, Vicar for Ecumenical Affairs for the Archdiocese of Boston. I have been, for the past 22 years, a trustee of the public library in the City of Boston. I wish to talk about the growing dependence on public library services by the elderly in our midst.

In 1900, the person who lived beyond the age of 50 was the exception. Three percent did so. Today, 10 percent of the population is classified as elderly, some 22 million people. By the end of this century, according to the Census Bureau, they will number 30 million. They account for 10 percent of the population. They account for 25 percent of the poor. Therefore, free library services in their communities are vital.

Many of the older Americans who use our libraries are among our "invisible" patrons. They have no library card and they never charge out books. But for them the library may be their most important resource, providing opportunity to escape the confinement of their rooms, to sit and read comfortably among other people in a pleasant atmosphere. Research on the twilight years of older Americans today indicates that older adults have a capacity for continued mental growth. Psychosocial research has established that age has nothing to do with intellectual acuity. Older people may not think as fast as they used to, but conclusions are just as sound, and their store of information and vocabularies can grow indefinitely.

They are enrolled, by the tens of thousands, in classes of universities and colleges. And, for them, the public library is, in great measure, their university library. Half of all elderly Americans, rich and poor, have no more than a high school education. Reduced income necessitates for them a complex of social services, food stamps, rent supplements, supplemental security income, Medicaid, Meals on Wheels, nutrition centers, reduced bus fares, and so on. Urban Institute studies concluded that most of the elderly poor have at most an eighth grade reading level; therefore, when confronted with government documents which demand their attention, they find it difficult to understand them. For these people, who have led self-sufficient, dignified lives, the psychological anguish can be devastating.

What are libraries doing to meet the special needs of this growing sector of American society? Weakening eyesight, physical frailty, loss of hearing, isolation from the mainstream of American life, and loneliness are inevitably part of the aging process. Various libraries supply a variety of special materials to help overcome these barriers—among these materials I give special mention to the large print weekly edition of *The New York Times*, the large print edition of *Reader's Digest*, the Library of Congress' talking books, and books in braille for those who cannot read ordinary print or cannot handle a book or turn a page.

About 60 percent of those served by these programs are over 60 years of age. These readers, who receive these special materials, receive them through a network of regional libraries which are paid for by the State and local libraries, not by Federal funds. But the Library of Congress estimates that as many as seven million people who are eligible to receive talking books, for example, are not now being reached.

Many public libraries are using volunteers to provide personal, individualized service to the lonely, the shut-in, the elderly. In Kenosha, Wisconsin, for example, public libraries train volunteers to read aloud at a center for the elderly. The Los Angeles Public Library has 250 volunteers working out of most of its 251 branches. The Central Library circulates more than 5,700 books, cassettes, and other materials each month for the elderly. In Muscatine, Iowa, an hour's visit goes along with each fortnightly book delivery, somewhat assuaging the loneliness of the aged. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, an "Over-60" Bookmobile makes regular stops in Milwaukee County at large nursing homes and homes for the aged.

MR. BECKER: There are some existing programs, such as those for the blind and the physically handicapped, programs for the aged, and special bills that carry special money provided by the Federal Government for services to these special constituencies. Do you think that these should continue to operate separately, because of their special objective, or should they be included in a national library act?

MSGR. MURRAY: I would tend to include them in a national library act, because a well-thought-out national library act should embrace our entire population, addressing all the needs of the population.

MS. JONES: Father Murray, the programs that you have described are imaginative, but certainly insufficient. In what ways will the national library act improve these programs, in contrast to additional funding under present legislation?

MSGR. MURRAY: Many public libraries tend to be restrained by the inability of their budgeting agencies to take care of everything; therefore, they have to cut down. Care and concern should be expanded, so that every part of the public could be cared for.

MS. JONES: Then there are two things. A goal under the National Library Act would also be increased funding. Otherwise, the provisions of that new Act would be frustrated. Are you saying what has been suggested earlier, that the project nature of LSCA—that is, you apply for special funding, and it is temporary—would no longer be a problem here, because it would be folded into regular . . .?

MSGR. MURRAY: I think Mr. Ladenson made that point. I agree that too many LSCA funds tend to go either for demonstration or experimentation, or to sustain the State agency. Therefore, too little is left to go to the grassroots where the money, I think, really was intended to go.

MS. JONES: If the national library act were passed, a task before librarians then would be educational, as far as libraries themselves are concerned, because funding is a problem now. It will continue to be a problem, and if it's up to individual librarians to include these programs in their budgets, the temptation might be, just as it is now, to exclude what people call "extra frills." They are really fundamental, but some of the same kinds of problems will still be facing us, even if you consider the national library act as a progressive step.

MSGR. MURRAY: I think that above everything else we need to depend on a greater degree of dedication of librarians to service in the community, because mere creativity, mere intelligence won't take care of the problem. There has to be dedication to the profession, and this is what library schools and libraries should try to instill in their professionals. They, in turn, should communicate to the larger community what can be done through the library. The library is the only educational institution we have for the community after college work is completed.

MS. JONES: Father Murray, do you realize that there is a Title IV in LSCA, which is specifically set up to give library services to the elderly, which has never been funded? This would be ongoing funding; this would not necessarily be demonstration projects. Wouldn't it be better to work for getting that one funded, rather than going into a new Act which doesn't even mention the elderly?

MSGR. MURRAY: Title IV was initiated by the Urban Library Council and the ALA precisely because the needs of the urban centers in the case of the elderly were so pressing. We think, however, that a comprehensive bill covering all Americans would be preferable.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Sandy Ferguson.

Statement of Sandra Nealy Ferguson

MS. FERGUSON: My name is Sandy Ferguson. I'm 15 years old and a sophomore at Walt Whitman High School, Bethesda, Maryland. I've used public libraries for as long as I can remember. I am here to testify, from personal experience, that public libraries are an essential part of the American public school system. Reading is the most important skill children can learn, not simply the ability to make out words, but to understand concepts and to unleash one's imagination and ideas. Children who read for pleasure are much more likely to be readers when they're adults than those who are never introduced to books.

Today's libraries are directing their effort to reach preschool children. Because play is the chief learning activity of these children, librarians are now supplementing their storytelling techniques with educational toys, games, and puzzles, along with books and other media. The librarians find that the children have learned to feel completely at home in the library, even before they are able to read.

A few years ago, the Queens Borough Public Library in New York developed a mobile "Library-Go-Round" unit to provide a "steppingstone" for kids who are left out of community preschool programs. Gaily decorated vans travelled the streets of the most economically depressed neighborhoods. At each stop a half-hour story presentation with songs, games, and fingerplays was given. The vans did not simply stop at a likely corner and wait for children to materialize; kids were actively sought out. The local poverty agencies helped pick locations, and their staff members went into the streets to gather children. Door-to-door canvassing was done. Special flyers printed in English, Spanish, and Italian told what the "Library-Go-Round" was, and when and where it was scheduled to appear. Library staff scoured neighborhood shops where parents might be with their children. Unfortunately, today there is no more "Library-Go-Round" for the children in Queens. Federal funds, whi had almost entirely supported the program, were cut off, and no lo or State dollars could be found to keep the mobile units on the streets.

The public library makes a very special contribution in helping a child to create a desirable environment for himself or herself—special because the child enters voluntarily to seek out books and records and games that amuse, challenge, help in understanding herself or himself and the world. Here, he or she is recognized as an individual worthy of respect. No matter what the background, the progress or lack of progress in school, the interests or hobbies, the child's preferences and desires are responded to. The public library offers an atmosphere that encourages the child's mind to explore and to stretch out.

Why do I use the public library? For one thing, the public library usually is open after my school library closes. One student put it another way, "The school library doesn't have the stuff we need." Many school libraries are primarily curriculum-oriented and can't begin to fulfill all of a student's requirements.

I can also go over to my public library on weekends, if not precisely to study, then just to sit and have a quiet place to read the latest Mary Stewart book. When I really *do* need to study and concentrate, I go to the public library because I am surrounded by silence, something I can't always find at home, not to mention having the world's knowledge at my fingertips.

I am a long time library user who started out reading *Lemonade Serenade* in the children's section of a small New England library, and have kept up the habit of coming back for books, advice, and guidance ever since.

I'm sure that one or more of my reasons fit the millions of high school students who use America's public libraries every year. That is why I am here today—to urge the passage of a new National Library Act to provide a fair share of Federal and State funds to public libraries. Thank you.

MR. WELSH: I'd like your advice on two questions that have been facing the library profession for a long time, and for which there have been inadequate solutions. The first has to do with the responsibility of the high school librarian for teaching kids how to use the catalog and how to use library services, so that when they get to college they can actually be ready. We find that they are not ready when they get there. Secondly, do you think that school libraries and public libraries ought to get together, and that school libraries should remain open, as do public libraries, all the time?

MS.FERGUSON: As for your first question, at the beginning of this year, the tenth graders supposedly were all taught how to use the library, but they never really were taught how to use it. You were given a sheet and told, "Find these things." If somebody would take the time and teach you, then when you get to college and throughout the rest of your life, you could use the library well and really get what you wanted in a short time.

As to your second question, I know that schools can stay open only until a certain time, and so it is very difficult to use the libraries, except during class days—and that's almost impossible unless you have a free period, which isn't very often. The public libraries and school libraries should get together, because the school libraries usually don't have all the things that you need. When you tell them that you need something, they say, "Go to the public library." If they got together, maybe you wouldn't have to make so many trips, and you'd know which library had the books that you needed.

MR. WELSH: The next witness is James Dillon.

Statement of James Dillon

MR. DILLON: My name is Jim Dillon. I am a sophomore at New York University. I am here to tell you why college students, particularly the hundreds of thousands of us who commute, are dependent upon public libraries as part of our educational resources. Students' use of public libraries to supplement the libraries of their own academic institutions is a well-established matter of record.

When public libraries, like the schools and colleges, were reeling from the impact of the postwar baby boom in the 1960's, a number of them took a look at just who their users were. An examination of the library habits of students in 80 institutions of higher education in New York City revealed that more than eight out of 10 students used some other library in addition to the one in their respective schools, and that half of them did so at least once a month. Public libraries provided the greatest part of this additional service. The authors of the study concluded that: "Most of New York's higher education students use, and use heavily, the wealth of library resources available to them in New York City to supplement, and, in some instances, to supplant the libraries provided at their own schools."

Another primary factor influencing the pattern of library use by college students is the quality of the college library. According to a report recently issued by NCLIS, the libraries of community colleges are seriously understaffed, their collections are only 50 percent of the indicated needs for their enrollments and programs, and access to these libraries is limited by short hours of service. Community colleges are the fastest growing sector in higher education, with an increase in enrollment more than fivefold since 1960, and continued growth is anticipated at least into the early 1980's. What this means in terms of increasing dependence on public libraries by community college students is self-evident.

The most significant rise in student use of public libraries has resulted from the phenomenal growth in the number of adults enrolling in educational programs. For the first time in our history, the majority of new students enrolled in universities are adult students continuing their education on a part-time basis. Part-time students have far outstripped increases in full-time enrollment. By 1980, there will be twice as many part-time students as there were in 1970.

In 1959, one adult in 11 was involved with adult education. By 1973, one adult in four was involved with adult education, and one in eight was heading for a degree. Among these are the middle management executives in their 40's and 50's, who feel the competition from more academically qualified younger men, housewives who want to reenter the job market, mid-career job changers, and adults who had dropped out of college and now simply want the satisfaction of "getting that degree."

These are highly motivated students, who must live off campus because of their family and job obligations. They tend to be keen learners, seeking extra reading in their fields and research for their papers. But quite often these goals cannot be fully achieved, because of the limitations of the college library. Time is a determining factor. Adult students often spend several hours getting to and from school. Even in New York City, where there's an extensive, somewhat efficient public transportation network, it can take more than an hour to travel from some parts of the inner city. For students who have to spend valuable time traveling to libraries, library hours are inadequate. The number of academic institutions served by a single public library can be staggering. One director of a public library in a New York suburban county recently estimated that he served students from 50 different colleges during any one-week period. Two colleges are located in the same geographical area this library serves, but the library is also used by commuting students who attend such major metropolitan institutions as New York University, Fordham, Fairleigh Dickinson, and Patterson State.

The most direct result of this shortchanging of public libraries is a restriction on the hours when libraries are open. For part-time and commuting students, a closed door often means complete denial of access to library materials. Even for full-time students, the need for extended-hour library operations is real. Students' need for libraries is especially heavy in the evenings and on holidays and weekends. These are the first hours eliminated when cutbacks in public library service occur to avoid overtime and other added costs associated with night and weekend use.

MR. BECKER: Our Federal Government has supported an interstate highway system, interstate telecommunications system, railroad networks. There's a great trend now in the country to establish a national information network that includes libraries, to provide the right of equal access to information, wherever people happen to live. This effort is all directed towards the use of computer in communications and the use of advanced technology. It's going to be your generation that will find the fruits of those efforts. What do you think is the Federal Government's responsibility with respect to a national information network?

MR. DILLON: I certainly see how a student could benefit by a national network for information. How that relates to the national library act, I'm not really sure. Could you be a little more specific?

MR. BECKER: I'm not sure myself, but in the National Library Act there is some discussion of technology; but it isn't as heavily emphasized as it is in other suggestions. I was trying to get a feel for your sense of proportion with respect to the importance of technology in a national library act.

MR. WELSH: Our next witness is Elizabeth Layne.

Statement of Elizabeth N. Layne

MS. LAYNE: I am Elizabeth N. Layne. I live in New York City and make my living as a free-lance researcher and writer. My livelihood depends on access to public libraries. Because of my interest in these institutions, I am enrolled as a student at the Library School of Rutgers University. I am also co-author of the book *For the People, Fighting for Public Libraries.*

I want to talk about the need for quality public library service to adult independent learners. First, who are adult independent learners? They are you, and me, and most all of us. An adult learner is anyone over 18 who is looking for a job and needs help in getting one. An adult learner is the mid-life woman who is returning to the job market. The adult learner is the full-time hospital aide who wants to earn the required academic credentials for promotion to nurse; the automobile mechanic who wants to become a lawyer; the retired person who is going to turn an avocation into a career; the prisoner who wants to earn a high school degree; the truck driver who wants literacy training. I am talking about major life-changing learning needs, needs that are of the utmost importance to the individuals concerned and to society at large.

People today are always on the move. They can expect to change careers three to five times during their lifetimes, to look for new jobs every two to three years. Frequently, people must go to work and acquire new skills at the same time. Educational institutions are rapidly adapting to these changes. It is now possible to obtain a degree without ever stepping into a classroom. The range of available academic options includes: credit by examination, credit for life experience, credit for correspondence courses. All of these options require self-preparation. Where does the public library come into this picture? Serving the needs of individual learners always has been a function of the public library. But I want to talk about quality library service to adult learners. Public libraries have many of the information resources that job hunters need. But these resources are scattered throughout the library and are, therefore, difficult for the average person to track down.

Eight years ago, when the recent wave of unemployment first began, the manpower commissioner in the industrial city of Yonkers, New York, suggested that the local public library pull together in one place all its job-related materials, including newspaper classified sections, announcements about civil service jobs, copies of special magazine articles, and so on. A librarian was placed in charge of the job information center—the task, to become an expert on resources in job hunting, and this included a gathering of complete and accurate information from the local community about employment and other services helpful to job seekers. That job information center exemplifies what I mean by quality library service to adult learners. The hallmarks are easy accessibility, accurate, up-to-date—local as well as general—information, and personalized, expert service.

In Forsyth County, North Carolina, the potential adult learner faces more than 250 agencies offering some type of program for adults. Each program has different rules, different costs, different times, different advantages and disadvantages. The potential learner needs reliable help from a mutual source in finding his or her way to an appropriate program. With the help of Federal funds, the Forsyth County Public Library opened an adult continuing education project to help people select the particular option best suited to their individual needs.

It is the rare person who can walk into a library and clearly articulate precisely what he or she wants in such a way that the librarian can effectively serve him or her. Libraries are complex entities. They require expert interpreters. In a few libraries in this country—in Woodbridge, New Jersey, and Tulsa, Oklahoma, for example—independent adult learners can receive in-depth, sustained help from an individual librarian throughout their learning project. In these libraries, time is taken to explore fully the learner's objectives, and to bring the entire resources of the library to the support of the learner's needs. Without that kind of help, much of the vital life-coping information available in public libraries simply is wasted.

There are other examples of the imaginative use of library resources to upgrade public access to them, but they are the exception not the rule. Nine times out of 10, it is Federal seed money that has made the project possible. Nine times out of 10, the project folds, or is continued on an inadequate basis, when that money disappears.

Quality library service rightfully belongs to all Americans. A fully funded new national library act will help secure that right for everyone, not simply for the lucky few.

MR. WELSH: You indicated that your livelihood depends upon access to public libraries. Isn't it also true that you're dependent on university libraries?

MS. LAYNE: That I personally am? Yes.

MR. WELSH: Wouldn't you favor, then, that this Act be extended to include all types of libraries rather than only public libraries?

MS. LAYNE: I understood that the Association of Academic Librarians did not want to be included in the Act. It would seem sensible to have one Act that covered everything, but I don't think that's a deterrent to its acceptability.

MR. WELSH. Our next witness is Al Herling.

Statement of Albert Herling

MR. HERLING: My name is Albert K. Herling. I'm an official observer of this White House Conference representing the International Labor Press Association, AFL-CIO-CLC. The last three initials stand for Canadian Labor Conference. Our headquarters are in Washington, D.C.; I reside in Greenbelt, Maryland.

The International Labor Press Association (ILPA) is composed of 640 labor publications, varying from local to city to statewide newspapers or magazines, as well as publications of national and international unions. We have a combined circulation of more than 22 million, and a readership estimated at 50 million men, women, children, and young adults.

From 1962 through 1977, I served as a member of the joint committee of the American Library Association and the AFL-CIO on library services to labor groups. The proposed legislation, S.B. 1124, introduced by Senators Jacob Javits and Edward Kennedy, has our complete support. The support is the natural continuation of American learners in star positions calling for, and backing, free public libraries, a position which predates the formation of the American Library Association, so this goes back a long time.

Today, this proposed National Library Act comes at a most crucial and opportune time—when library budgets are being ruthlessly cut, even though demand, and the need for library and information services are on the increase. We particularly support the concept that the State advisory councils on libraries be broadly representative of persons using such libraries.

We urge that broad representation include organized labor on the State advisory councils which the proposed legislation calls for. We are in total agreement with the definition of "public library" as a library that serves, free-of-charge, all residents of the community, district, or region. We also commend the bill's definition of "public library services" as meaning library services furnished by a public library free-of-charge. Our emphasis is on the word "free," because of the increasing tendency of some public libraries to institute charges for certain services in order to compensate for the disturbing budget cuts. Most ominous, is the fact that some political legislative bodies are requiring public libraries to institute the service charges to compensate for the very cuts they themselves instituted.

We also warn against the tendency on the part of some library systems to reduce the more or less universal character of their collections, in order to concentrate on so-called best sellers, so that they may justify their presence on the basis of huge circulation gains. Such a development negates the full meaning of public library that we have come to believe in and reduces the library to a modern counterpart of the commercial lending libraries which were so prevalent in my youth in the 1930's. It sets a dangerous precedent which would lead legislators to base future funding of public libraries, not on the proper per capita basis, but on the basis of circulation figures alone. Sacrifice of the library collections from the universal nature to this limited approach is betrayal of learning and betrayal of the public trust.

I regret that the time available for this testimony is necessarily so short. There are specific items of interest that were precluded from being brought to the floor, but our overriding consideration is to declare our unequivocal support for S.B. 1124. We will join all others favoring this legislation in vigorous activity in behalf of its enactment, and pledge that the American labor press will do its part in this effort.

MR. WELSH: Our next witness is Tryntje Van Ness Seymour.

Statement of Tryntje Van Ness Seymour

MS. SEYMOUR: My name is Tryntje Van Ness Seymour. I am part-time public information officer for the National Citizens Emergency Committee to Save Our Public Libraries, and editor of its newsletter on library needs and problems, *Private Wire*. I have attended nine Governor's Conferences, and my job requires me to review all available press clippings on the financial plight of public libraries.

The present economic situation of America's public libraries should be a source of shame for a Nation which pretends to be cultured, well-educated, and civilized. We have permitted the financial burden of public libraries to fall on the shoulders of those least able to bear it—the middle-income families who spend a disproportionate share of their resources on regressive property and sales taxes. The result has been predictable. Many libraries have watched their funding base erode away. Others have become the victims of taxpayer strikes, like California's Proposition 13. The impact has been felt by libraries, large and small, in all corners of the Nation.

In Cynthiana, Kentucky, employees at the city's public library do not earn the Federal minimum wage of $2.95 an hour. Just last month, when the library board found it was unable to pay a promised raise because of lack of funds, three of the library's staff of five employees resigned. The salaries at the Louisville Public Library were so low last year that the library could not compete with the starting salaries offered at nearby Jefferson Community College, the University of Louisville, or Jefferson County Schools.

The Free Library of Philadelphia's last minute financial reprieve from the city council budget saved the library from having to shut down 12 branches. But the library is still $2 million short, and suffering from a staff reduction of 107 employees; the elimination of all outreach programs, including service to the homebound, hospitals, prisons, and day-care centers; and the cut-back of $550,000 from the book budget, while the cost of books continues to climb upward at the rate of 10 percent a year.

The public library budget crunch is not confined to big cities. The town of Lake Zurich, Illinois, population 6,789, woke up recently to discover that its library staff had begun to move books and other library materials into storage—because of lack of funds.

The brand new $500,000 public library in Point Pleasant, West Virginia, has this sign on its front door: "Closed until further notice." Federal LSCA funds financed the start of construction on the library but the money has stopped coming, and local funding is non-existent.

Earlier this year, the electricity, heat, and telephone services at the Mason, West Virginia, Public Library were shut off for lack of funds in the county budget. And in Mason City, Iowa, the public library's book budget is so pressed that local citizens recently launched an emergency drive to raise $10,000 so the library can buy enough new books. This is one "heckuva way" to run a public library system. The time for catch-as-catch-can financing should be behind us.

Every public library should be sufficiently funded in regular annual governmental budget allotments to provide an adequate level of library service to all segments of the general population within the library's area of service. We know now what basic services public libraries should offer today, and we know that special services can help meet the special needs in most communities. The time has come to put these lessons into use. The time has come to bring about a national program of public library funding that will assure fair access to public libraries on an equal basis to all Americans.

Congress should enact, and the President should sign into law, a new national library act to provide a stable and equitable funding base for America's public libraries, and the Act should be fully funded at the earliest possible date.

MR. WELSH: Our next witness is Marjorie Stern.

Statement of Marjorie Stern

MS. STERN: My name is Marjorie G. Stern. I am President of the San Francisco Public Library Commission, a delegate-at-large to the Conference from California, and a member of the elective board of the Urban Libraries Council.

In California, the tax reform measure called Proposition 13 has compelled us to think the unthinkable, to confront the inconceivable—the very real possibility, indeed the growing probability—that our public libraries are condemned to a living death; to a near-catatonic state in which we are incapable of delivering the library and information services that these times, and our democratic society, urgently require. On June 6, 1978, it appeared that the end might come quickly, surgically. Now, buffered by two years of diminishing state surpluses, it promises only to linger: a slow march of reduced service hours, declining staffs, fewer book purchases, slow but certain deterioration.

Virtually overnight, Proposition 13 wiped out about two-thirds of the property tax revenues on which local governments—and our libraries—depended. The impact, despite State bail-out funds, has been shattering. In less than two years, Californians lost 11,000 hours of weekly access to their libraries. Book budgets have been cut 20 percent; staffing (in full-time equivalents), 21 percent; and 1,228 employees have been laid off. Of 3,800 public library outlets open in 1978, 308 (eight percent) have been closed. In San Francisco, further cuts threaten to reduce book purchases, even more to force the closing of more than one-third of our branch libraries. In Culver City, the book budget was cut from $25,000 to $1,000; the children's book budget from $7,500 to $500. San Diego's library staff was slashed from 23 to 9. In San Fernando, the $12,000 book budget was cut exactly 100 percent. Rural libraries throughout the State face closure. Can coma be far off?

Our libraries have not been unaccustomed to subsistence diets. As long as we lived mainly on property taxes we, like libraries across the Nation, sometimes faced famine, often little more than maintenance, through never a feast. Reasonable and necessary growth came slowly and hard. Proposition 13 has now slammed the door on even that impoverished way of life. The future of the State bail-out money is at best uncertain. It spells the end in California of reliance on local funding—and not only in California, but in communities and States across the Nation. Not merely survival alone, but the insistent library needs of the 1980's, demand a formula in which Federal and State, as well as local governments share equitably the responsibility for maintaining and modernizing these vital services.

That necessity should be eased somewhat by the knowledge that Proposition 13 each year enriches our Federal hosts by $1.6 billion. Our own State government gains an additional billion dollars. These funds were once property taxes; revenues to which we might have looked, if not for growth, at least for a shabby respectability. We think it fair and just that these windfalls be shared in meeting the essential needs of our libraries.

Beyond that, we must recognize that our urban libraries particularly are no longer purely local concerns. Our San Francisco Public Library has become the focal point of a spreading network of library and information services. They reach beyond our city's 49 square miles to the far shores of the Bay Area and the foothills beyond. Our Bay Area Reference Center services 8.5 million people in California's 46 northern counties. Our resources, special collections, and extensive archives draw scholars, writers, students from across the Nation. San Francisco can no longer afford, however much it might wish, to foot the bill for these far-reaching services. In fairness, it should be shared generally among its farflung beneficiaries.

One further word. Some, with near-total insensitivity, have suggested user charges as a replacement for lost income. No tax could fall with greater injustice on those least able to afford it. No more effective barrier could be raised to services for those who are—by reason of economic status, health, age, or otherwise—unable to pay for them. No conceivable tax could do greater harm to the notion of a free society. We think that that proposal is abhorrent.

The National Library Act, S.B. 1124, offers survival—and a great deal more. It meets, in good time and with good sense, the growing needs for modernizing our public libraries. It meets with justice the demand for sharing their support and, with understanding, the need for more generous, broader-based support.

MR. WELSH: Our next witness is Patty Klinck.

Statement of Patricia E. Klinck

MS. KLINCK: My name is Patty Klinck, and I am from Montpelier, Vermont. Vermont is a State with approximately 480,000 people. The State ranks 48th among the 50 States in per capita income and has 220 public libraries, 50 percent of which serve populations under 2,000. Small to say the least. I address my testimony to two aspects of S.B. 1124.

Although I believe in additional funding for public library services, S.B. 1124 in its present form is not flexible enough to meet all States' needs. It also discriminates against small, rural States with scattered population centers. In its attempt to solve local funding problems, I think its approach becomes oversimplified and sometimes discourages, rather than promotes, public library initiative.

Before I get to specifics, I want to note that the wording in the bill caused me a great deal of confusion, because there were ambiguous terms, lack of specificity, which not only cause confusion now, but could cause complex problems later on.

I'm going to address two aspects of S.B. 1124 that probably have been addressed before. The first is the national library agency. Creating a national library agency, as part of this particular piece of legislation which deals primarily with public libraries, is similar to creating a national energy agency and then saying, "You have responsibility only for coal." I am opposed to the creation of a national library agency if it is to be only one more of the many Federal bureaucracies that deal with libraries. If a national library agency is to be viable, its first priority should be to coordinate all of the significant libraries and library agencies at the Federal level. These could include libraries, such as the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, Agriculture, as well as those agencies which deal with all other types of libraries at all levels. The components could constitute the library of last resort for a national library network. The establishment of any national library agency should require special legislation for that purpose only, separate and distinct from any one type of library, with duties and responsibilities clearly delineated. A national library agency should not be identified with only one segment of the library community, because it would continue the ongoing fragmentation of library services.

I also wish to address the public library funding formula, as proposed in Title II of the Act. Although increases are needed in the funding levels of public library services, I, representing a rural State, urge that the funding formula ratio as proposed be drastically restructured. Federal mandating of State funding levels and distribution policies which interfere with States' rights and responsibilities are likely to cause severe funding and policy problems in many State legislatures, possibly leading to a decline rather than an increase in library services. For example, in Vermont the formula would force a doubling of State dollars, at this time costing the State between $.75 and $1 million. Because of inflation, tight money, and anti-taxation feelings at both the local and State levels, this formula is highly unrealistic in a small, rural State.

In some States, local control is very near and dear to the hearts of the populace. Funding distribution requirements must ensure that, even if local funding were relieved, local incentives and responsibilities would not be eliminated; that accountability and equity would be maintained; and that both rural and urban interests would be considered. Although many public libraries work hard and get fine tax support on the local level, there are some, at all levels, that really are unwilling to do this. Unique needs, regional differences, and political structures have to be taken into account. Per capita distribution of dollars may mean more money, but it does not necessarily result in better anything. In fact, it goes against many management and public accountability philosophies. Per capita distribution of library funds in a rural State can discourage initiative, retard cooperation, and destroy creativity, leading to a waiting for the yearly handout.

Again, although public libraries need additional aid, we have to beware of any oversimplified approach that takes into account only one element of what is a very complex problem.

MR. WELSH: I agree that the question of a national library agency, or one aspect of it, can lead to further fragmentation. It's interesting that when the Commission conducted an open forum on the National Periodical Center, this topic evoked, I think, the greatest concern, and at that level of detail. The proposal made by the Council on Library Resources did attempt to deal with it on a larger basis. Do you agree, however, that there should be a national library agency that would attempt to coordinate all library activities?

MS. KLINCK: It should, perhaps, deal with one area at a time. After much discussion, the Vermont delegation felt that because the Federal specialized libraries are likely to be the libraries of last resort for a national network, this might be a good place to start.

MR. WELSH: Our next witness is Paxton Price.

Statement of Paxton Price

MR. PRICE: I am the executive director of the Urban Libraries Council, an organization representing the urban public libraries of the United States and Canada. It's composed of 112 libraries which serve an aggregate of more than 50 million people.

I would like to call the attention of the Conference to the National Library Act, a study bill introduced in the Congress last Spring with bipartisan sponsorship. My remarks are confined to the rationale for this legislation, and the need for this Conference to favor its enactment.

The National Library Act has been proposed for adoption by this Conference, as one of the recommendations issued to the President and the Congress, to correct the incomplete effectiveness of present Federal financial assistance to public libraries. The present Federal program, originally enacted with limited purposes, has been amended several times and increased in dollar amounts. But the larger urban public libraries were the first to suffer financial disaster when the sources of their local income were subjected to crippling catastrophes, and the present program offered no consequential relief. The Nation must take steps to curb and prevent these catastrophes.

Since the States, when these dire fiscal circumstances struck, were not then in a position to effectively come to the aid of these stricken institutions, the time has arrived, if it has not passed, for the country to undergird its public library service with a financial support plan that provides multi-governmental level contribution. The National Library Act provides that very scheme, plus it uses a new feature in Federal financial aid that acts as a sustaining stimulus for other governmental level support.

The National Library Act was conceived and constructed in concert with known segments of the library community having legislative interests. The Act evolved from an open meeting to which all were invited to air their concepts and needs for an improved legislative program, and the resulting study bill is endorsed by legislative committees of trustees, State librarians, and public library administrators. The proposed National Library Act thus represents applied legislative research, which constitutes a considerable achievement in group dynamics, but it is still an unfinished recommendation—a mere proposal. In actuality, the Act awaits further refinement, through the legislative process, from other segments of our system of governments, and with other concepts that may emerge from this Conference. But, important above all, the National Library Act constitutes a collectively refined beginning which obviates the need to expend further time to construct another bill in its stead.

The former LSA and the present LSCA have had sufficient time to change the library service weaknesses in the several States which they were designed to correct. But, during their existence, new economic events have occurred which are unaffected by LSCA, and which have made deep inroads in the extent and quality of services expected of public libraries. To prevent further deterioration by these same economic forces, there is now a need for a replacement Federal library law that counteracts a sudden and stringent decline of public service which so overwhelmingly depends upon only one source of income—the local property tax. The National Library Act would reduce this unpredictable decline and shore up the public library's financial support from insufficiently engaged State sources. The Urban Libraries Council endorses this act.

MR. WELSH: A few years ago, you were with what is now the Department of Education. Would you have favored a national library agency, then?

MR. PRICE: I think that I would, but I haven't given that enough thought to formulate a firm position.

MR. WELSH: What role do you see for the Department of Education in a national library agency?

MR. PRICE: I imagine that they would be transferred to it.

MR. WELSH: Do you think that all library-related activities would be transferred to it—for example, programs such as the Veterans Administration?

MR. PRICE: Other than the Library of Congress, I think they would.

MR. BECKER: We have heard very interesting presentations that dramatize the plight of the public libraries in our country and the need for the Federal Government to do something about it. We've also heard indirect suggestions for additional study of an Act of this kind. We have heard that such a bill, at least as it's now prepared, is insufficiently comprehensive, and that it should take into account other libraries, and perhaps the private sector; that the formula for distribution of funds per capita should use either different percentages or be a different type of formula. Someone said that it extends the status quo, and doesn't look into the future sufficiently. Others have said that the networking and the resource-sharing are of lower priority than helping public libraries to buy additional materials. And then there is the question about where the organization belongs in the Federal hierarchy. These ideas need to be developed further. Let's talk a little about what we see of the ensuing process.

MR. PRICE: This hearing, and the witnesses for and against the National Library Act, are part of the legislative process. After the various organizations of the public and the library community have been stimulated by these challenging ideas, they should formulate positions that represent their members; and these positions should be presented at the open hearings held by Congress for the National Library Act. The wisdom that would emerge would be a result of the weight of evidence presented and the deliberations of the congressional committees and bodies.

MR. WELSH: Our last scheduled witness is Bob Asleson, who is substituting for Paul Zurkowski.

Statement of Robert Asleson

MR. ASLESON: I am Robert Asleson, president of the R.R. Bowker Company, a Xerox publishing unit. I am a delegate-at-large at this Conference, representing the Information Industry Association (IIA), of which I am chairman. IIA is a trade association of about 150 commercial firms engaged in the creation and marketing of information products, services, and systems at the production, distribution, and retail level.

The major focus in the open hearing this afternoon is the National Library Act—introduced as S.B. 1124 by Senators Javits and Kennedy. Senator Javits clearly indicated that a number of important questions have been intentionally left open to stimulate further consideration, and that the bill would be revised as a result of recommendations emanating from this White House Conference. Therefore, we will comment on our perceptions of the general thrust of the legislation, as it pertains to this country's overall debate and discussion on the efficacy of developing national information policies. It is, after all, one of the stated purposes of this Conference to help shape policy on public access and distribution of information in the United States.

Both in regard to the Conference and the legislation, it is unclear to what extent the legislation takes into account its impact on, and relationship with, other parts of our total information environment. Of primary concern to us, as a trade association, is the effect on the private sector participants, information access, and distribution activities. We are concerned not only with the effect on existing and future commercial services, but also with the effect on the many innovative library and information services that have been developed and continue to develop in the noncommercial part of the private sector.

The National Library Act wisely restricts Federal activity with regard to State and local library conduct. On the other hand, it does not yet define any restrictions on activities that might duplicate, or unduly damage, private sector information activities. In fact, within the Conference itself a major unresolved question, from our point of view, relates to the meaning of the last words in the title of the Conference, "and information services." What do these words mean to the delegates? Are they the information services that are already being provided through libraries? Are they the extensions of these services? Or are they the new technology-based information services that are now available in the marketplace and will continue to multiply?

If they are the former services, such as book lending and other traditional services, the issues being addressed in this Conference fairly approach them. If they are the latter, however, this Conference does not address them in any significant way. For example, does the Conference propose to call on the Commerce Department to formulate a program designed to promote and facilitate the development of commercial activity in the private sector? Does the international calendar of the Conference address the problems of trade barriers for such economic goods produced by American commerce? We do not see these problems being discussed. Moreover, even to the extent that the Conference focuses on information services merely as extensions of traditional library services, there remains a whole set of questions, relating to the impact of such services on the economics of marketplace-based information services, which has not been addressed, and which this Conference is not structured to address or deal with.

This shortcoming is indicative of the unbelievable complexity of developing public policies concerning information, as distinct from public policies concerning libraries. IIA recognizes the need to develop coherent information policies, and we're committed to playing an active role in this process. We do this, not simply as a trade association concerned with the economic well-being of its membership, but also because we believe that the viability of the democratic system of government unquestionably depends on quality, diversity, and freedom from bureaucratic control of the information available to the citizens.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Becker, do you want to respond to the question about the attempt of the Conference to deal with the future issues, like the preservation of information services?

MR. BECKER: I'm not sure I can. It's quite clear that the Congress and the President are interested in recommendations that have to do with the full gamut of information services, although I guess that's subject to some interpretation as well. It was our hope, as a Commission, always that the White House Conference would face the total spectrum and that it would not be limited just to libraries. However, because of the way in which we have been organized and the manner in which things have happened, there's been a natural tendency for that to happen, because the overwhelming interest and representations of libraries have been paramount thus far. The kinds of things described by Mr. Asleson are genuine interests on the part of many, and need to be addressed in future forums.

MR. WELSH: We will now hear from other witnesses who have registered. The first is Lotsee Smith.

Statement of Lotsee Smith

MS. SMITH: I'm expressing concern for the American Indian people. I'm a member of the Commanche tribe. I have three major points. The first deals with the responsibility of serving American Indians; the second deals with information needs; the third deals with the training of Indian people.

On the first point, no one wants to take responsibility for library services to American Indians. The tribes who live on reservations say that they do not have a tax base, and therefore cannot provide the services. The States say that the tribes are an entity unto themselves, that it's not their responsibility, that it belongs to the Federal Government. The Federal Government says, "Oh, yes, we have the Bureau of Indian Affairs for that." The Bureau of Indian Affairs says, "We serve schools. We have public health clinics. But we do not serve in the way of community life." In school libraries, they will not accept responsibility. So our problem is, whose responsibility is it? There really are no funding sources for American Indians except Federal grant programs.

On the second point, American Indians have the same information needs as everyone else, but I cite some examples offered by tribal people. They say, "We want legal materials. We want the State statutes. We want the State code. We want to see what the law says. We don't want to go to someone else any longer and say, 'What does the law say?' We want to see it ourselves. We want regulations in our libraries, at our hands. We want treaty documents. We want the documents that define our boundaries. We want material related to our own people." They have said to me, "People are always coming out and studying us. They come out and they write their theses, or their dissertations, or the anthropologists come visit us. We never know what they say about us. We would like to see those things in our libraries, so that we all know what they said about us."

Those are just a few examples. Indians are very interested in art and design. If Indian people are going to achieve self-determination, which is the direction in which the Federal Government is taking them, they must have information at hand. They know they need it; they just don't know how to get it, or where to go; and they don't have the technical expertise to get it, which leads to my point. In all of the country, there are about 25 American Indian Masters Degree Library Science professionals. There are also very few trained para-professionals on reservations, or in the areas where they can serve. Sometimes language is a problem. I advocate Indian people serving their own people because of the language, and because of intricate cultural matters that an outsider cannot understand. Indian people must serve their own people.

My third point is that we need an area to train people. In the proposed National Library Act, I do not see anything that addresses any of these concerns. The Act talks primarily about existing libraries and assumes a lot of things that simply are not there among the Indian people. Therefore, I'm asking, on behalf of the Indian people, for the support of the Commission in these areas.

MS. LEITH: Do you feel that a separate Indian library act is necessary, or do you feel that it would be stronger if it was incorporated into some other comprehensive library act?

MS. SMITH: I don't know. I have a proposed set of resolutions which one work group is going to submit. Perhaps another title should be added which specifically addresses some of these concerns.

MR. VELDE: How is that five-year program in the Department of Interior that Mary Huffer is working on?

MS. SMITH: It's on hold. Nothing is really implemented at all. Mr. Velde is referring to a five-year plan which some of us worked on and submitted. I think we finished our work a couple of years ago, and nothing is happening right now. We hope, as a stimulus from this Conference, that we may get some things going.

MR. VELDE: Why is it on hold?

MS. SMITH: Again, pinning down the responsibility seems to be the issue. There are no line items, within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for funding either community libraries or training personnel; and so, we're trying to get a line item in the budget. That's very difficult to do, especially when they are always reorganizing. By the time you get one person educated, that person is gone, and you have somebody else, and you have to start all over again. They are receptive. They do listen. They are not antagonistic. But it's just simply part of the bureaucracy.

MR. WELSH: This situation is especially disappointing because the Commission did play a role in this. I didn't know that nothing was done with it. The next speaker is Miv Schaaf.

Statement of Miv Schaaf

MS. SCHAAF: I am Miv Schaaf, alternate from Pasadena, California. I am on the board of the Friends of the Pasadena Public

Library, and founder of the Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission. I write a twice-weekly column for the *Los Angeles Times*.

Our children are trained to be consumers, told that happiness is buying things. If we want them to find the joy that is to be found in using one's mind, as well as one's money, we must begin early. For this reason I wrote, with Sam Shepherd, the resolution that the California delegates adopted at the California Governor's conference on March 4th in Sacramento and reaffirmed unanimously at the August and October followup meetings. It is foremost in the California position papers. The resolution is:

"Establish as mandatory in the State education code that the specific amount of time for instruction in library usage shall be set beginning in kindergarten and continuing through Grade 12."

As an alternate, I've been asked by our delegation to read our final California position paper:

"The California delegation reaffirms the American right and tradition of free public libraries. We reaffirm the recommendation of the 300 delegates of the March 1979 California Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services:

"1) libraries must reach out to the unserved and the underserved. All barriers—physical, financial, legal, attitudinal, and technological—must be eliminated so as to serve everyone;

"2) continuous, ongoing funding can be mandated, Federal, State, and local. Best use of such money must be made, eliminating overlapping duplication, involving obtaining high standards and local control;

"3) establish as mandatory, in the State education code, that a specific amount of instruction in library usage be set beginning in kindergarten and continuing through Grade 12;

"4) libraries must stir themselves, reach out to get people involved in an enjoyable use and political promotion of their libraries;

"5) libraries aren't invisible. Libraries must wake up the public—tell them what joys, information services, programs are to be found in libraries, and what dangers face libraries;

"6) libraries must be aware of and take advantage of political, social, economic, and technological changes, to see that current information is made easy for everyone to use;

"7) we support the Public Library Association's position statement;

"8) we support, in concept, the National Library Act."

MR. WELSH: The next witness is Marlene Halverson.

Statement of Marlene Halverson

MS. HALVERSON: My name is Marlene Halverson. I am with the Commission for the Advancement of Public Interest Organizations in Washington, D.C. I am speaking as an individual today, but the Commission does concur with my views.

The work of public interest citizens' action organizations has been instrumental in improving the quality of life for all citizens of the United States. Their unstinting efforts, for example, have prevented the loss of thousands of lives on our Nation's highways, helped to preserve and protect pristine environments and endangered species, resulted in laws to protect the public health from hazardous products and toxic substances, helped—and added measures—to ensure the public accountability of large corporations, and led to government requirements in truth-in-labeling our food supply.

In conjunction with that advocacy, these organizations publish a vast array of educational reports, documents, papers, periodicals, and books of great potential value to educators, government officials, technical specialists, and to the general public. Taken together, these publications are a growing and provocative agenda of public concern: from civil liberties to self-reliance, foreign military policy, health, housing, food policy, meeting energy needs safely, preserving the environment, and appropriate technology. They contain news and information which could help citizens make informed choices in their daily lives in exercising their citizenship. They give students fresh perspectives on current issues, and can inform policymakers in and out of government.

It is unfortunate, then, that they are not yet widely available to the public, even through community libraries. Significantly, they are not yet generally documented in established readers' indexes or reference systems used by the public. These publications are advocacy literature in the best traditions of our country.

The Commission for the Advancement of Public Interest Organizations has published a guide to public interest groups and periodicals. It is a first effort to make this information more publicly accessible. However, the cooperation of librarians and information centers is essential to this endeavor. Heretofore, for example, these publications have been largely ignored by them. Therefore, I recommend that the delegates to the Conference recommend a major effort, designed: 1) to place this literature in the mainstream of information dissemination in this country; and 2) to catalog and index for reference the topics treated in these pages.

Positive steps that can be taken by the Conference delegates include: 1) to propose that information centers and systems such as the established *Reader's Guide* and *The New York Times Information Bank* add the periodicals of public interest groups to those that they regularly monitor for use and information; 2) to see that these are included in the National Periodical Center, so that all libraries and information centers can access them for library users; 3) to encourage libraries, particularly community and public libraries, to carry examples of this literature; and 4) to confirm that this literature is represented in the information system of the Library of Congress, so that these messages are available to our readers.

MR. WELSH: Our last witness is Frank C. Mevers.

Statement of Frank C. Mevers

MR. MEVERS: I am Frank Mevers from New Hampshire, a State archivist and historian by profession. I would like to talk about historical documents that need preservation and conservation. Information on past actions and decisions of government, at all levels, is essential to an understanding of the past and planning for the future. Only a portion of such information is contained in printed materials and deposited in libraries. The major sources of the archives and historical manuscript collections are preserved in the National Archives, the Library of Congress, State and Territorial archives, and historical agencies and libraries throughout the Nation. Funding is needed to identify, collect, describe, preserve, and make this material available to the public.

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Society of American Archivists, along with the American Historical Association, and the Organization of American Historians, have recognized and supported these needs.

We ask that the White House Conference support contributions of these agencies to the preservation of the Nation's historical and cultural heritage, and endorse the statement of needs and priorities, as practiced by the National Historical Publication and Records Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities. We also ask the White House Conference to endorse continued authorization for the funding of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and to increase the funding for this Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities to make these records better organized and more accessible to the public.

MR. WELSH: I thank each and every one of you for your presentation.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the hearing adjourned.)

WRITTEN TESTIMONY SUBMITTED TO WHCLIS OPEN HEARINGS

PAGE

ALLAIN, Alex P.; "Imperative Need for Understanding of the Importance of Libraries;" Representing: personal concerns 455

ALPERS, Helmut; "Physical Preservation of Information Materials;" Representing: personal concerns 458

APSELOFF, Marilyn; "Priority Funding for Children's Services;" Representing: Children's Literature Association 461

ASLESON, Robert F.; "National Library Act (S. 1124) in the Context of National Information Policy;" Representing: Information Industry Association 462

ASP, William G.; "A COSLA Statement on S.B. 1124;" Representing: Chief Officers of State Library Agencies 463

AVRAM, Henriette D.; "Technical Standards in the Fields of Library and Information Sciences and Related Publishing Practices;" Representing: American National Standards Committee Z39 468

BALESTER, Vivian S.; "Proposing the Establishment of a National Law Library;" Representing: personal concerns 474

BATTLE, Thomas C.; "Minority Group Needs for Public Library Service: A Statement in Support of the National Library Act;" Representing: personal concerns 480

BENDER, Ivan R.; "Copyright Librarians and the New Copyright Act;" Representing: U.S. Copyright Office 481

BEVERLY, James E.; "The Proposed Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation;" Representing: personal concerns 482

BOWSER, John A.; "Library Facilities for the Urban Poor;" Representing: Philadelphia Urban Coalition 490

CAROTHERS, Stuart; "Subject Access via Computer for the Blind;" Representing: Recording for the Blind 491

PAGE

CLAYTON, John A.; "A Proposal for an International Freedom of Information Exchange to be Offered by the Government of the United States;" Representing: personal concerns 493

COCCO, Cecily; "Library and Information Service in Rural Areas;" Representing: personal concerns 496

COHEN, David; "Brief for Ethnicity Input into the Conference Proceedings;" Representing: Ethnic Materials Information Exchange Task Force 498

COLAIANNI, Lois Ann; "Medical Information;" Representing: Medical Library Association 504

CRAYTON, James E.; "Concerns of Black California Delegates and Alternates;" Representing: California Librarians-Black Caucus 505

DILLON, James P.; "National Library Act—College Students' Needs for Public Libraries;" Representing: personal concerns 507

DOLNICK, Sandy; "Role of Friends of Libraries USA;" Representing: Friends of Libraries USA 510

ELY, Donald P.; "Information and Education in a Multimedia World: Nonprint Communication Technologies;" Representing: personal concerns 511

FAUST, Helen; "Service to Children;" Representing: Girls' Coalition, Philadelphia 514

FERGUSON, Sandra Nealy; "National Library Act—Students' Need for Public Libraries to Supplement School Libraries;" Representing: personal concerns 516

FOSTER, Graeme; "International Cooperation and Understanding: Australia and the United States;" Representing: personal concerns 518

FOX, Robert; "Libraries and Contemporary Literature;" Representing: personal concerns 521

FRASE, Robert W.; "Protocol to the Florence Agreement;" Representing: personal concerns 529

GALVIN, Thomas J.; "The National Library Act and Other Library Legislation;" Representing: American Library Association 533

Written Testimony Submitted—Table of Contents

PAGE

GOGGIN, Margaret Knox; "Education Issues for Library/Media/Information Management;" Representing: Association of American Library Schools 549

GOODENOW, Robert J.; "The Microtechnological Revolution and the Necessity to Monitor its Advancement;" Representing: Advanced Communications Institute of America 552

GRAVES, Frank M.; "Aggregating the Market for Information Systems;" Representing: personal concerns 553

GRILLS, Caroline; "Microforms: Microfilm and Microfiche Have Solutions to Information Handling and Linking Problems;" Representing: National Micrographics Association 556

HALVERSON, Marlene; "The Emerging Literature of Public Interest/Citizen Action Organizations;" Representing: Commission for the Advancement of Public Interest Organizations 557

HARDY, Joseph R.; "Improving Library and Information Services for Indian Communities;" Representing: personal concerns 561

HERLING, Albert K.; "A Bill to Promote the Further Developments of Public Library Services and for Other Purposes;" Representing: International Labor Press Association 564

HERSHEY, Dale R.; "Library and Information Service in Rural Areas;" Representing: personal concerns 565

HOLAHAN, Paulette, and A.C. Strip; "Federal and State Funding for Public Libraries;" Representing: personal concerns 569

HUFFMAN, Stanley A.; "Technology, Knowledge, and Society;" Representing: Virginia Educational Media Association 570

HUNTER, Linette; "Island Communities of the United States: Issues to Consider;" Representing: Island Communities of the United States 573

JACOBS, Roger F.; "Legal Materials in Public Libraries;" Representing: personal concerns 574

JACOBSON, Nancy C.; "If Public Libraries are to Survive . . .;" Representing: personal concerns 575

PAGE

KING, Kamla J.; "Establishing Law Collections in Public Libraries;" Representing: personal concerns 578

KLEIN, Arnie; "Endorsement of Efforts to Promote Use of Independently Produced Films and Video Recordings;" Representing: U.S. Conference for an Alternative Media 579

KLINCK, Patricia E.; "National Library Act—General;" Representing: personal concerns 579

LADENSON, Alex; "What Is Wrong with the Library Services and Construction Act;" Representing: personal concerns 581

LAMSON, Robert W.; "National Policies for Information and for Improving the Policy Process;" Representing: personal concerns 582

LANDAU, Herbert B.; "Information Science;" Representing: American Society for Information Science 585

LAYNE, Elizabeth N.; "Needs of the Independent Adult Learner;" Representing: personal concerns 588

MALLOY, John A.; "Saving—Serving—Selling: Libraries and Information Sampling Costs;" Representing: Pi Beta Alpha 591

MARSHALL, Cheryl; "Information and Library Service Needs of the Poor;" Representing: personal concerns 593

METOYER-DURAN, Cheryl; "Information Needs of American Indian Reservation Communities;" Representing: personal concerns 596

MEVERS, Frank C.; "Preservation of Archival Materials;" Representing: personal concerns 598

MITRISIN, Sophie; "Private Libraries: a Neglected Service and a Neglected Resource;" Representing: personal concerns 599

MURRAY, Right Reverend Edward G.; "Adequate Public Library Services for the Elderly;" Representing: personal concerns 602

NEELY, Eugene T.; "Library Statistics;" Representing: American Library Association, Statistics Section 605

NELSON, James A.; "Continuing Library Education;" Representing: Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange 606

PAGE

O'HALLORAN, Charles; "National Library Act—Alternatives to Federal Involvement;" Representing: personal concerns 608

PLONSKI, Witold; "Right of Access to Ethnic-Related Information;" Representing: Polish-American Ethnic Community 612

POST, Joyce; "Role of Indexing in the Future;" Representing: The American Society of Indexers 613

PRICE, Paxton P.; "National Library Act—General;" Representing: Urban Libraries Council 616

RUSSELL, Harold; "The Handicapped and Libraries;" Representing: President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped 618

SCHAAF, Miv; "California Position Paper;" Representing: California Delegation to WHCLIS 619

SCHUCKETT, Sandy; "National Library Act and Service to Children;" Representing: California Delegation to WHCLIS 621

SEYMOUR, Tryntje Van Ness; "Financial Plight of Public Libraries;" Representing: Citizens Emergency Committee to Save our Public Libraries 622

SEYMOUR, Whitney North, Jr.; "National Library Act-National Library Agency;" Representing: Citizens Emergency Committee to Save our Public Libraries 624

SHIELDS, Dorothy; "Service to Labor;" Representing: AFL-CIO 625

SHIPMAN, Jule; "National Library Act—Funding;" Representing: Pennsylvania Delegation to WHCLIS 642

SMITH, John; "The Library Needs of the Deaf;" Representing: Coordinating Committee for Deaf Counseling 644

SOO-HOO, Theodore; "Two Important Gaps in Many Library Systems;" Representing: Tenley Library Council 645

SPRAUVE, Gilbert; "International Information Exchange and the Role of the Virgin Islands;" Representing: personal concerns 646

STERN, Margaret; "Neighborhood Branch Libraries;" Representing: Interbranch Library Users' Association 649

PAGE

STRIP, A.C., and Paulette Hollahan; "Federal and State Funding for Public Libraries;" Representing: personal concerns 569

STUEART, Robert D., and Ching-chih Chen, Peter Hernon, and Peter A. Neenan; "Citizen Information Seeking Patterns: a New England Study;" Representing: U.S. Office of Education Project, Boston 651

TAYLOR, Betty: "The Proposed National Library Network and Law Libraries;" Representing: American Association of Law Libraries 657

TSUNEISHI, David; "Proposed Resolution from Asian/Pacific Area Participants;" Representing: personal concerns 658

WEISS, Marion; "Film as a Means of Information Dissemination;" Representing: University Film Association 659

WHITE, Alvin; "Current Topics of Importance in World Brain Development;" Representing: personal concerns 662

ASSOCIATIONS REPRESENTED IN OPEN HEARINGS TESTIMONY

PAGE

Advanced Communications Institute of America; Testimony of Robert J. Goodenow 552

AFL-CIO; Testimony of Dorothy Shields 625

American Association of Law Libraries; Testimony of Betty Taylor 657

American Library Association; Testimony of Thomas J. Galvin 533

American Library Association, Statistics Section; Testimony of Eugene T. Neely 605

American National Standards Committee Z39; Testimony of Henriette D. Avram 468

Written Testimony Submitted—Table of Contents

	PAGE
American Society of Indexers; Testimony of Joyce Post	613
American Society for Information Science; 3timony of Herbert B. Landau	585
Association of American Library Schools; Testimony of Margaret Knox Goggin	549
California Delegation to WHCLIS; Testimony of Miv Schaaf	619
California Delegation to WHCLIS; Testimony of Sandy Schuckett	621
California Librarians—Black Caucus; Testimony of James E. Crayton	505
Chief Officers of State Library Agencies; Testimony of William G. Asp	463
Children's Literature Association; Testimony of Marilyn Apseloff	461
Citizens Emergency Committee to Save our Public Libraries; Testimony of Tryntje Van Ness Seymour	622
Citizens Emergency Committee to Save our Public Libraries; Testimony of Whitney North Seymour, Jr.	624
Commission for the Advancement of Public Interest Organizations; Testimony of Marlene Halverson	557
Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange; Testimony of James A. Nelson	606
Coordinating Committee for Deaf Counseling; Testimony of John Smith	644
Ethnic Materials Information Exchange Task Force; Testimony of David Cohen	498
Friends of Libraries USA; Testimony of Sandy Dolnick	510
Information Industry Association; Testimony of Robert F. Asleson	462
Interbranch Library Users' Association; Testimony of Margaret Stern	649
International Labor Press Association; Testimony of Albert K. Herling	564

PAGE

Island Communities of the United States; Testimony of Linette Hunter 573

Medical Library Association; Testimony of Lois Ann Colaianni 504

National Micrographics Association; Testimony of Caroline Grills 556

Pennsylvania Delegation to WHCLIS; Testimony of Jule Shipman 642

Philadelphia Coalition of Girls; Testimony of Helen Faust 514

Philadelphia Urban Coalition; Testimony of John A. Bowser 490

Pi Beta Alpha; Testimony of John A. Malloy 591

Polish-American Ethnic Community; Testimony of Witold Plonski 612

President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped; Testimony of Harold Russell 618

Recording for the Blind; Testimony of Stuart Carothers 491

Tenley Library Council; Testimony of Theodore Soo-Hoo 645

University Film Association; Testimony of Marion Weiss 659

Urban Libraries Council; Testimony of Paxton P. Price 616

U.S. Conference for an Alternative Media; Testimony of Arnie Klein 579

U.S. Copyright Office; Testimony of Ivan R. Bender 481

U.S.O.E. Project, Boston; Testimony of Robert D. Stueart 651

Virginia Educational Media Association; Testimony of Stanley A. Huffman 570

Testimony Submitted by Alex P. Allain

Imperative Need for Understanding of the Importance of Libraries

As I appear before you today, I am utterly convinced that what we here do may well determine the course, the welfare, and the destiny of this Nation, and perhaps others, for generations to come. Time constraints make it necessary that I speak of the roots and the trunk, not the limbs, twigs and leaves. Hence I will go directly to the point.

Much has been written about waste, yet there has been nothing in the press nor the other media about the criminal waste of our most important resource, our population, which forms its most basic natural resource. There are two essentials for the best human existence possible: bodily food without which life cannot be sustained; and intellectual nourishment, without which mental acuity cannot be achieved. Whatever has been done in this Nation and elsewhere has been accomplished through the use of the mind, which directs man's literary, artistic, or manual skills.

The libraries of this Nation form the very core of its informal and formal educational system, and the compendium of human knowledge is uniquely contained within the libraries of the Nation and the world. Libraries are undoubtedly the most universally used tool for the acquisition of this essential knowledge. No lawyer, no doctor, no scientist, no engineer, no individual can function completely or intelligently without access to the knowledge which books contain. Human beings enjoy a reasoning ability centered in the mind, and nothing comes into that mind save through the senses. When education fails, knowledge regresses; and if we as a Nation continue to regress, we will certainly be buried.

Knowledge, however, is only part of being a civilized human being. Another is the ability to understand. Even total knowledge, if it could be achieved, would be only the skeleton of a building which, without understanding would have neither walls nor roof. It is said that one may have much knowledge but, being without understanding, be truly ignorant. An example of this might be the lack of understanding of the simple truism in both morality and law that no liberty in the context of the fifth or the fourteenth amendments grants any license to harm another person or another person's property. Failure to understand this basic doctrine has caused grief beyond measure. And the cost to the Nation of acts of vandalism, arson, and murder must run yearly into billions, though money is less important than the sorrow and the anguish suffered by the victims who are permanently scarred.

Complete lack of understanding is also evidenced by bigotry, bias, prejudice, and hatred. It has always been morally and legally wrong to denigrate anyone's human dignity within the meaning of person as used in the Constitution of the United States, a meaning which excludes no one.

A serious question must be posed: How much grief, bitterness, strife, hatred, and disorder have been caused by the lack of understanding of this simple doctrine and how divisive is this lack of understanding, which undermines our national unity? Understanding, as basic as knowledge to the full development of the mind, is stored in our libraries.

The Senate of the United States tells us that $20 billion are being spent because of functional illiteracy. How much better these funds could be spent for other purposes. This is the waste that I speak about today as being almost criminal, and I urge that something be done about it, that the highest priorities be placed in developing each individual to his fullest potential through the arts, the sciences, technical, or manual skills.

It was for this reason that the resolution known as the Louisiana Resolution was written for the Louisiana Governor's Conference. It was approved by the American Library Association, and adopted by the legislature of the State of Louisiana. Copies memorializing Congress were sent to the Louisiana delegation. The reasoning set forth in the resolution forms the raison d'etre of this Conference, for it speaks to the highest priorities which must be given to libraries as the prime, though not the only, source of the knowledge basic to understanding. Yet, there are still thousands of secondary and elementary schools throughout this Nation without any library facilities at all. There are still thousands of communities unserved by any libraries. There are still universities and technical schools with inadequate libraries to support the degrees which they offer.

In addition, library education is as important as the acquisition of books and other materials, for no library of any type can function without an individual trained in acquisition, collection development, reference, and other necessary professional techniques. Library schools should be fully supported to train the professional librarians who will devise the best plans of use and best plans of service for available facilities and for tying these facilities together in a network of libraries to best serve our Nation.

It may well be that secondary and elementary school libraries should have the best professional librarians available and be well-stocked with books, for it is at this level that the formation of the mind begins. There can be no equality of persons if there is no equality of opportunity, especially for our young people. At this level, we begin either the fulfillment of the individual or his waste.

A great leader of our Nation, far wiser than your speaker, wrote in 1816:

> *"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." (Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to Col. Charles Yancey dated January 6, 1816.)*

Therefore, in view of the foregoing statements supporting the Resolution on Priorities, the Louisiana delegation hereby offers the following resolutions for consideration by this Conference:

1) That the administration of Federal programs for libraries be at the highest possible level within the new Department of Education;

2) That the Library of Congress be established by law as the National Library of these United States, with appropriate mandates for the exercise of leadership and achievement of excellence for our Nation's libraries; and

3) That government at all levels--local, State, and Federal—be requested and urged to recognize that libraries are essential and fundamental to the integrity and development of the mind of a free people and, accordingly, libraries must be highest in the list of priorities for which governments are responsible.

ADDENDUM:

Proposed Resolution:
Policy on Priorities

Whereas, the Nation's most important resource is its people;[1] and

Whereas, the strength of this resource lies in the development of each individual's mental acuity; and

Whereas, the mind is the source of reason and understanding[2] and therefore the source of inspiration, invention, achievement, and social accommodation; and

Whereas, the primary key to reason and understanding and the source to it is knowledge;[3] and

Whereas, the development of the mind depends upon access to the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of mankind and the compendium of such knowledge and wisdom are the books, documents, and information resources which uniquely are the library collections of this Nation; and

Whereas, the preservation of all libraries,[4] the expansion of their collections and the improvement of public access to them is indispensable to the development of the mind; and

Whereas, the development of the strength of the people and the Nation and their ability to understand[5] is essential to the Nation's advancement and accomplishment of its goals and purposes;

Therefore be it resolved, that government at all levels, local, State, and Federal, be requested and urged to recognize these simple truths and give them the highest precedent in their list of priorities, as a logical imperative for the benefit and the general welfare[6] of the people of the States and the Nation.

Footnotes

[1] This statement should stand unchallenged for the simple reason that every human development in every field is accountable to the mental acuity of the individual making the development.

[2] In addition, the mind controls the body through the nerve system, medical evidence supports this. Conversely, without the ability to reason and control the nerve system the individual is a vegetable.

[3] It is indisputable that there are other sources, however, knowledge has always been recognized as a primary source of discipline and understanding.

[4] All libraries here refer to every type of library within the public domain.

[5] Understanding does not imply agreement but most often includes acquiescence for purposes of accommodations as distinguished from capricious, arbitrary and unreasonable actions of government absent understanding. Example, national defense is essential to the nation's welfare yet without understanding this necessity, people are disinclined to give their support. The same is true of energy, etc.

[6] Welfare here is used in its constitutional sense as found in the United States Constitution and as it undergirds all of the social programs.

Alex P. Allain

Testimony Submitted by Helmut Alpers

I appreciate the opportunity to present testimony on the subject of physical preservation of information materials and I wish to particularly address the area of preservation of rare and valuable library materials which are now stored in libraries and other repositories. A crisis exists which demands action now on the part of all levels of government and the public.

I believe a brief word regarding my credentials to speak on this subject are in order. I have spent 18 years of my business career with the IBM company, during which I was deeply involved in information systems. In my last position, I was the key individual in IBM's Data Processing Division, responsible for bringing a networking capability to IBM's product line. For the last four years, I have been associated with the General Bookbinding Company, a library binding firm of which I am a part owner. I want to further state that there is very little financial gain that our company would achieve through any major programs in the preservation area.

In view of this background, I believe I can bring perspective to this important subject, which I feel has been overlooked in much of the material that we have been presented from NCLIS. This is not a criticism. It usually is overlooked since it is a problem of the "backroom" or technical services area of the library and is, thus, out of sight. In addition, Ohio delegates had little awareness of this crisis. It was only after diligent effort by a number of people at the Ohio pre-White House Conference that the subject of preservation of information materials was discussed and finally accepted as one of Ohio's 16 recommendations.

Turning now to the problem. It exists primarily in our research libraries and academic institutions. There are also a number of public libraries that provide outstanding research collections and these are included as part of the library community facing this problem.

We are here at this White House Conference to develop thoughts and recommendations that are key to the *future* of libraries and I fully support this activity. However, in the area of preservation there is an *immediate crisis* before us at this very moment. I have attached as part of this testimony a brochure which my company made available to the members of the Ohio pre-White House Conference which states the problem. It is entitled "No Tomorrow for Library Collections Unless."

The problem can be summarized by giving a few statistics: 1) Six million out of 17 million volumes in the Library of Congress are too brittle to be given to users; 2) Fifty percent of New York Public Library's five million book collection are in an advanced stage of disintegration; 3) The Barrows Research Laboratory, which focused on this problem until its demise, determined that only 10 percent of the paper used in books published between 1900 and 1949 would survive this century if given the best of care; 4) Columbia University has one and a half million books in its five million book collection falling apart; 5) Publishers continue to print on paper which is not of an archival quality. Archival paper is more expensive and, thus, books would be more expensive, which would limit the market. Thus, books being printed this very day will be part of the preservation problem within the next 25 to 50 years. It is a problem which is being compounded by the increasing number of publications that are being collected by libraries today.

Based on much of the literature which I have read in preparation for this Conference, one would surmise that the book is doomed. The November 10, 1979, issue of *College and Research Library News* carried as a cover article a synopsis of Stanford University's Libraries Director David Weber's address to the University of Oklahoma's School of Library Science in September on the subject of research libraries in the year 2030. I quote . . . "extensive collections of published materials on specific topics will remain the heart of the academic library. Despite many changes," Weber concluded, "libraries today will share a great many similarities in theory, operation, and a host of particular problems with those of the 2030's. Fifty years hence, libraries still are apt to have quiet reading places for students to absorb and integrate their classroom and laboratory studies with printed information in a variety of formats."

The Codex format has been with us for over 1,000 years and has proven to be a most efficient means of presenting information. Despite the many technological advances that have occurred in computing in the last 20 years, and are sure to continue along with video disc, enhanced microfiche capabilities, etc., the book is sure to continue.

In summarizing the problem, we have a crisis today and one which is going to continue to be with us for the foreseeable future. I urge that the delegates to this Conference in each of the five theme areas not overlook this critical problem.

It would be inappropriate to only present a problem and not suggest some solutions. I do not feel that this is a forum to propose a comprehensive preservation program. However, there are some obvious things that should be done now and I hope will be stimulated further by the results of the White House Conference.

First, I urge that the delegates to this Conference agree that one of our final resolutions here at this Conference should recognize the crisis which our academic and research libraries face today. This is a significant problem which our libraries must correct now. We should make the preservation of library collections a mandatory item for Federal financial support. Funds made available now will save enormous amounts of money in subsequent preservations programs. If we do not act now the problem will become increasingly worse as I hope has become clear from my previous statements.

These funds should be used not only for microfilming and deacidification programs, but also to permit libraries to air-condition their stacks. Anyone who has visited the stacks at the New York Public Library Research Division would be struck with the enormous wealth housed at 42nd Street in New York. This information wealth is deteriorating to a great extent, because the building was erected prior to the development of air-conditioning. The 42nd Street library is a jewel among research libraries and I believe should receive an immediate grant to correct the deficiencies. Other key research libraries should also receive such support. Air-conditioning and humidity control will significantly enhance the life of the printed materials stored in these libraries.

Money should be made available for research and evaluation of deacidification processes so that the library community can have confidence in an effective method of preservation. Once resolved, additional monies should be allocated to the key centers in the United States whose collection would justify such an investment.

One of the requirements of an emerging problem of this scope is that qualified restorers are needed and training courses, such as the one already initiated at Columbia University, should be established at other sites. Microfilming of the material and storing of master negatives under optimum conditions should also be undertaken. There are a number of other recommendations which could be made. Suffice to say that it is a problem which is solvable given the proper resources.

In conclusion, preservation of collections in our academic and research libraries must be addressed *now* if we are to preserve the information for the future; information, which will in time, I am certain, appear on videodisc or in computer memories, but which at the present time is perishable. If we are going to exercise our responsibilities to the generations to come we should act *now* to assure that enhanced funding for this critical area is made available by the Federal Government.

Helmut Alpers
Chairman
Ohio Delegation

Testimony Submitted by Marilyn Apseloff

Priority Funding for Children's Services

Although libraries are usually at the bottom of the funding pile, when monies are made available to them, children's services are often given short shrift. This is a plea for a change in priorities, for if we want to encourage lifelong learning, if we hope to have intelligent adults who will use and love libraries and be willing to fight for them, we must start with children and those who work with them. More funds must be available for the purchase of children's literature, records, tapes, and films, and the needs of adults concerned with children and their literature—including writers, educators, teachers at all levels, concerned parents, students, and institutions as well as librarians—must also be met. More funds are needed for secondary source materials so that scholarships and research in children's literature can be encouraged. Such studies will direct more attention toward an area that is too often deprecated or ignored. It is shortsighted for college professors, for example, to denigrate the study of children's literature and in the next breath to complain about their students' inability to read and write.

The Children's Literature Association is trying to remedy the situation by disseminating information on children's literature through the CHLA *Quarterly,* the annual conferences, the conference proceedings, and by working with publishers and other organizations. We have established a scholarship to help members with research, and we present an annual award for the most significant critical article written during a given year. Libraries are crucial to meet our goals, to meet what should be the country's goals: a heightened awareness of children's literature so that we can make book lovers of children, and a determination to educate their parents to realize the importance of good books for children. Therefore, I urge you on behalf of children everywhere to keep their needs in the forefront of your deliberations. After all, our future will be in their hands.

Marilyn Apseloff
Children's Literature Association

Testimony Submitted by Robert F. Asleson

The National Library Act (S.1124) in the Context of National Information Policy.

I am Robert F. Asleson, president of R.R. Bowker Company (a Xerox Publishing Company). I am a delegate-at-large to this Conference, representing the Information Industry Association, of which I am chairman. IIA is a trade association of about 150 commercial firms engaged in the creation and marketing of information products, services, and systems at the production, distribution, and retail levels.

I would like to thank the leaders of this Conference for the opportunity these open hearings present to those of us who care so deeply about how information is put to use in this great country and in the world beyond its borders.

The major focus in this open hearing this afternoon has been the National Library Act, which has been introduced as S.1124 by Senators Javits and Kennedy. Senator Javits clearly indicated that a number of important questions "have been intentionally left open to stimulate further consideration," and that the bill would be revised as a result of recommendations emanating from this White House Conference.

In that spirit, we will refrain from commenting at this time on specific aspects of the proposed legislation. Instead, we will comment on our perceptions of the general thrust of the legislation as it pertains to this country's overall debate and discussion on the efficacy of developing national information policies. It is, after all, one of the stated purposes of this Conference "to help shape policy on public access and distribution of information in this country."

Both in regard to the Conference and the legislation, it is unclear to what extent the legislation takes into account impact on, and relationships with, other parts of our total information environment. Of primary concern to us, as a trade association, is the impacts on the private sector participants in information access and distribution. We are concerned not only with the impact on existing and future commercial services, but also with the impact on the many innovative library and information services that have developed, and continue to develop, in the noncommercial part of the private sector. The National Library Act wisely restricts Federal activity with regard to State and local library conduct. On the other hand, it does not yet define any restrictions on activities that might duplicate or unduly damage private sector information activities.

In fact, within the Conference itself, a major unresolved question from our point of view relates to the meaning of the last words in the title of the Conference: "and Information Services." What do these words mean to the delegates of this Conference? Are they the information services that are already being provided through libraries? Are they simply extensions of these services? Or are they the new technology-based information services available in the marketplace?

If they are the former—services such as book lending and other traditional library services—the issues being addressed in this Conference fairly approach them. If they are the latter, however, this Conference does not address them in any significant way. For example, does the Conference propose calling on the U.S. Commerce Department to formulate a program designed to promote and facilitate the development of this commercial activity in the private sector? Does the international panel of the Conference address the problems of trade barriers to such economic goods produced by Americans? We do not, at least so far, see such problems being addressed.

Moreover, even to the extent that the Conference focuses on information services merely as narrow extensions of traditional library services, there remains a whole set of questions relating to the impact of such services on the economics of marketplace-based information services which has not been addressed and which this Conference is not structured to address or deal with.

This shortcoming is indicative of the unbelievable complexity of developing public policy concerning *information,* as distinct from public policy concerning libraries. The advent and rapid growth of technologies already described by numerous speakers at this Conference will certainly increase this complexity.

IIA recognizes the need to develop coherent information policies, and we are committed to playing an active role in this process. We do this, not simply as a trade association concerned with the economic well-being of its membership, but also as a believer that the viability of a democratic system of government is unquestionably dependent on the quality, diversity, and freedom from bureaucratic control of the information available to its citizens.

We thank you for this opportunity.

Robert F. Asleson
Information Industry
Association

Testimony Submitted
by William G. Asp

A COSLA Legislative Proposal

Effective functioning of American democracy requires access to library and information services for all citizens. Therefore, the greatest possible scope and quality of library and information services should be available to all citizens. Each level of government has appropriate roles and responsibilities to perform which are complementary to one another, and each level must provide strong leadership in the development of library and information services.

In addition to the funding of important Federal library and information services agencies, three Federal programs currently assist in strengthening and developing library services at the local, State, and Territorial level through public libraries, school library media centers, and academic libraries, as follows:

1) Public libraries are assisted under the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). LSCA Title I provides allotments to the States to assist in the development of public library services including services for the blind, physically handicapped, and institutionalized persons. LSCA Title II, for which funds have not been appropriated since 1973, is designed to allow Federal assistance in the construction and remodeling of public library buildings. LSCA Title III provides funds to the States to assist in developing interlibrary cooperation programs involving all types of libraries.

2) Title IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) provides funds to the States for reallocation to school districts for purchase of library materials and instructional equipment.

3) Academic libraries are aided under the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II-A which provides grants to institutions of higher education for the purchase of library materials. Title II-B of the Higher Education Act provides grants for training in librarianship and for research and demonstration projects. HEA Title II-C provides special grants for no more than 150 research libraries, including academic libraries, independent research libraries, and State and other public libraries with collections significant for scholarly research. The long-range goal is a National Library Act which would integrate the above components.

The legislative changes presented here deal primarily with one component of the proposed National Library Act and are concerned with public library service and interlibrary cooperation. This component would be titled the Library Development and Network Act, and its provisions could be measured against proposals arising from the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

The sharing of resources is not only desirable in a day of new technologies, it is essential. Therefore, there is now a new emphasis on networks and communication. At the same time, each network or cooperative effort (local, statewide, or multistate) is only as strong in service as the libraries composing it. Only when libraries are serving their primary clientele in an optimum way can shared resources be utilized to the fullest for the benefit of the citizens. The following are some basic considerations:

1) The new Act shall require an overall advisory council in each state for its implementation. The council shall be representative of all types of libraries and their constituencies. The council shall establish expanded committees to advise on planning and policy development for the implementation of any title of this Act.

2) The new Act shall require all libraries receiving Federal funds to agree to share their resources in statewide library networks.

The effectiveness of almost all library activities and services can be enhanced by the library's participation in library networks. Wherever Federal funds are used to support library activity or service, it is appropriate that the recipient library participate in the State's library network.

3) In those circumstances where multistate library networks are the most feasible mechanism for sharing resources and services, multistate library network operations shall be funded by participating states and their participating institutions. State library agencies are the appropriate agencies for channeling continuing Federal support under their respective State plans. Federal discretionary grants to multistate networks under specific titles or "set asides" shall be granted by USOE/OLLR only for a specific project such as research, pilot demonstration, start-up cost, etc., and shall be appropriately coordinated with the long-range plans of the participating States.

4) A State plan and criteria shall be developed for each title of this Act.

5) The Federal aid formula to the States shall retain the present principles of basic state allocation and equalization based on population and income factors.

6) State library agency matching requirements shall apply to each title except Title V.

ADDENDA:

Library Development and Network Act:
Title I—Network Development

The library network in each State is an essential component of the national network. Funding for developing and operation of statewide library networks is a shared responsibility of the State and Federal governments. Federal funds allotted to the State library agencies shall assist the States in developing and maintaining strong statewide multitype library networks, including, but not limited to any or all of the following:

1) Development and maintenance of bibliographic access, communications, and delivery systems within each State, including multistate and national links, to facilitate sharing of library resources;

2) Development and maintenance of mechanisms for providing access to resources and financial assistance for collection maintenance and development in major network resource libraries identified in the State plan including major urban resource libraries and major academic libraries;

3) Development and maintenance of mechanisms for providing access to resources in privately funded library collections including, when necessary, reimbursement for heavily used collections;

4) Demonstration, establishment, development, and maintenance of intrastate multitype library systems, where appropriate, including financial assistance for such systems based upon the state network development plan, adopted standards and formula;

5) Participation in multistate library networks when such participation is the most feasible mechanism for sharing resources and services.

Requirements:

1) A statewide library network development plan identifying objectives to be accomplished over a five-year period. This plan shall be prepared by the State library agency with the assistance of the State's advisory council after seeking recommendations from all network participants in the State.

2) State library agency matching.

3) Maintenance of effort to ensure at least a base level of State funding for network development and operation.

Title II—Public Library Services

It is the purpose of this title to provide for the needs of local library clientele by the provision of direct recurring grants for public library services and/or by the provision of statewide services to local public libraries whenever economical and appropriate by:

1) Providing direct aid for public library service based on the State's adopted standards and formula;

2) Providing special purpose demonstration and establishment grants based upon the State's adopted criteria for administering grants and contract administration;

3) Providing for statewide services to public libraries.

Requirements:

1) State library agency matching;

2) Maintenance of effort.

Title III—Service to Special Constituencies

It is necessary to provide specialized public library services for persons who are disadvantaged by reason of cultural, educational, economic, or physical handicapping factors and persons who are confined to various types of institutions. To accomplish this purpose, it will be necessary to:

1) Provide a program of library services for the educationally, culturally, and economically disadvantaged, and other special clientele who cannot use or gain access to regular library services for whatever reason;

2) Provide a program of services to institutionalized persons;

3) Provide a program of services to persons who are blind or physically handicapped.

Requirements:

1) State library agency matching (Title III match qualifies);

2) Maintenance of effort.

Title IV—Library Planning and Development

State library agencies are the focal point for statewide planning, coordinating, and developing of library services in the state. Through their leadership and the collaborative efforts of other libraries and agencies, comprehensive planning, multitype resource sharing and networking are developed. It is the purpose of this title to provide grants to assist the states in strengthening the State library agency in library development and coordination through: 1) planning and evaluation; 2) studies and research; 3) coordination with other Federal library grant programs; 4) planning for State network development and coordination with regional and/or national networks; 5) continuing education and staff development of personnel crucial to the effective implementation of this Act; and 6) administration of Federal grant funds available under this act.

Requirements:

1) State library agency matching funds for these developmental services only in same ratio (federal-state) as other titles in the act;

2) The funds received from this title are supplemental and are not intended to replace State funds needed for State library agency operation or use Federal funds to carry out the State responsibilities.

Title V—Public Library Construction

There exist an estimated 8,490 public library buildings in need of remodeling or replacement because they have architectural barriers preventing free access to services by persons with physical disabilities. Funds are also needed to decrease the large backlog of needed new construction projects and for remodeling of buildings for energy efficiency. The purpose of this title is to:

1) Provide for modification of existing structures to become barrier-free and/or energy efficient;

2) Provide for acquisition and modification of existing structures;

3) Provide for new construction.

Requirements: State and/or local matching.

William G. Asp
Chief Officers of State
Library Agencies (COSLA)

Testimony Submitted by
Henriette D. Avram

Technical Standards in the Fields of Library and Information Sciences, and Related Publishing Practices

In the United States, the principal responsibility for developing and promoting standards for information systems, products, and services rests with the American National Standards Committee Z39: Library and Information Sciences and Related Publishing Practices.

Z39 is a standards-developing committee created in 1939 by the American Standards Association (predecessor to ANSI, the American National Standards Institute) at the request of the American Library Association, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Medical Library Association, and the Special Libraries Association. The Secretariat (sponsor) of Z39 is the Council of National Library and Information Associations.

During 1977 and 1978, a task force appointed by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) reviewed the activities of Z39 and recommended that, in view of the continuing need for standardization within the information-handling community, Z39 step up its level of activity, and that the committee also seek a broader funding base to support its standards development program.

Z39 develops standards relevant to information systems, products, and services as they relate to libraries, information services, and publishing. The Committee also encourages the use of these standards in library, publishing, document delivery, information dissemination, and information and data handling systems. Z39 functions to ensure that American national standards within its scope remain dynamic, that duplication of work is minimized, that promulgation of conflicting standards is avoided, and that individual enterprise and initiative are encouraged.

Internationally, Z39 participates in the development of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards for librarianship, documentation, and related information handling, including information systems and interchange networks as applied to documentation. Many current ISO standards are adaptations of ANSI Z39 standards.

460

How Z39 Standards Are Developed and Adopted: The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) has set formal procedures for the development and approval of American national standards. In Z39, a subcommittee is appointed which develops the proposed standard, which is then submitted to the Z39 member organizational representatives (presently 57) for comment and vote. If there are negative votes, the subcommittee tries to resolve them, and this may lead to changing the text of the proposed standard and reballoting. At the same time, comment from interested persons outside Z39 is solicited through a notice in the ANSI biweekly publication *Standards Action*. Z39 responds in writing to any negative comments that are received. Once this public review is complete, the proposed standard is submitted to the ANSI Board of Standards Review (BSR), along with the record of the voting, any other pertinent documentation, and a certification that the ANSI procedural requirements have been met. If the BSR approves the standard, the fact is also published in *Standards Action*, after which the standard is prepared for publication by ANSI.

ANSI requires that all published standards be reconsidered every five years for possible reaffirmation, revision, or discontinuance. Each of these alternatives follows the same procedures as used when developing a new standard. Z39 standards are published and sold by the sales department of ANSI, and must be ordered from ANSI, not Z39. Periodically, ANSI issues a brochure listing the available Z39 standards along with prices and ordering information.

Z39 Membership: The current full voting membership of Z39 consists of 57 library, information service, indexing, abstracting and publishing associations, organizations, government agencies, and business firms. In addition, information memberships have recently been offered. A quarterly newsletter—*The Voice of Z39*—has a circulation of over 1,000. The administrative office of Z39, under an executive director, is maintained at the National Bureau of Standards.

Z39 Accomplishments

Published Standards. The first Z39 standard was published by ANSI in 1967. Since that date, 32 additional Z39 standards have been published for use by libraries, information services, and publishers. These standards fall into several distinct areas, as follows:

The Publication Process (Format, Style, Procedures):
- *Trade Catalogs,* Z39.6-1965 (Reaffirmed 1977)
- *Basic Criteria for Indexes,* Z39.4-1968 (R 1974)
- *Directories of Libraries and Information Centers,* Z39.10-1971 (Reaffirmed 1977)
- *Title Leaves of a Book,* Z39.15-1971
- *Guidelines for Format and Production of Scientific and Technical Reports,* Z39.18-1974
- *Guidelines for Thesaurus Structure, Construction, and Use,* Z39.19-1974
- *Proof Corrections,* Z39.22-1974

Format for Scientific and Technical Translations, Z39.31-1976
Synoptics, Z39.34-1977
Periodicals: Format and Arrangement, Z39.1-1977
Writing Abstracts, Z39.14-1979
Preparation of Scientific Papers for Written or Oral Presentation, Z39.16-1979

Provision of Access to Publications:
Book Numbering, Z39.21-1973
Technical Report Number, (STRN), Z39.23-1974
Bibliographic References, Z39.29-1977
International Standard Serial Number, Z39.9-1979

Marketing:
Criteria for Price Indexes for Library Materials, Z39.20-1974
Advertising of Micropublications, Z39.26-1975
Describing Books in Advertisements, Catalogs, Promotional Materials, and Book Jackets, Z39.13-1979

Statistics:
Library Statistics, Z39.7-1968 (Reaffirmed 1974)
Compiling Book Publishing Statistics, Z39.8-1977
Compiling Newspaper and Periodical Publishing Statistics, Z39.39-1979
Compiling U.S. Microform Publishing Statistics, Z39.40-1979

Standardization of Contents of Publications:
Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals, Z39.5-1969 (Reaffirmed 1974)
System for the Romanization of Japanese, Z39.11-1972 (Reaffirmed 1978)
System for the Romanization of Arabic, Z39.12-1972 (Reaffirmed 1978)
Romanization of Hebrew, Z39.25-1975
System for the Romanization of Slavic Cyrillic Characters, Z39.24-1976
Development of Identification Codes for Use by the Bibliographic Community, Z39.33-1977
Romanization of Armenian, Z39.37-1979
System for the Romanization of Lao, Khmer, and Pali, Z39.35-1979

Computer-relevant Bibliographic Standards:
Bibliographic Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape, Z39.2-1979

Z39 Standards in Process: In addition to the 33 published ANSI Z39 standards, Z39 subcommittees are concluding their work on seven new standards:
Single Title Order Form for Library Materials
Bibliographic Information on Microfiche Headers
Romanization of Yiddish
Serial Holdings Statements at the Summary Level

Identification Code for the Book Industry
Serial Claim Form
Standard Order Form: Multiple Title, Hard Copy

Z39 Current Program: Beginning in late 1978, a new standards program has been developed based on proposals and suggestions received from the library, information science, and publishing communities. At its March and May, 1979, meetings the Z39 Executive Council approved 26 new topics for possible development into standards. Each topic was then assigned a priority ranking, based on the need and impact of the potential standard. Subcommittees will be formed which, based on the priority rankings and the availability of funds, will develop these topics into candidate ANSI standards. This list of proposed standards is dynamic; new topics will be added as suggestions from the community are received.

The following brief descriptions of the new proposed standards are presented by general area of application. The number of standards listed that are pertinent to data base construction illustrates the increased technology. The desire to exchange data increases the need for standards that facilitate exchange.

Preparation of Materials:
- *Form for Copyright Transfer*
- *Paper and Bindings for Library Books*
- *Page Margin Dimensions for Serial Publications*

Publications and Marketing:
- *Serial Publication Pattern Codes*
- *Computer-to-Computer Invoice Format*
- *Computer-to-Computer Title Update Format*
- *Target Audience Code*
- *Codes for Computer Typesetting Control*

Provision of Access to Publications:
- *Bibliographic Data Identification Codes for Patent Documents*
- *Journal Article Identification Code*
- *Number Systems for Patent Applications*
- *Romanization of Korean*
- *Machine-Convertible Romanization Systems*
- *Serial Holdings Statements at the Detailed Level*
- *Interlibrary Loan Forms and Procedures*

Data Base Construction:
- *Code for the Representation of Languages*
- *Codes for Library Patron Identification*
- *Codes for Library Item Identification*
- *Coded Character Sets for Bibliographic Information Interchange*
- *Serial Holding Statement Format for Information Interchange*
- *Identification of Bibliographic Data Source Files*
- *Codes for the Representation of Physical Medium, Document Type, and Bibliographic Level of Documents*
- *Codes for Identification of Kinds of Patent Documents*

User/Retrieval System Interface Language
Computer Network Protocol for Library and Information Science
Encoding Chemical Structure Information

Z39 Executive Council: The Z39 Executive Council is responsible for the overall program of standards development in Z39. The Executive Council, which is chosen through election by the Z39 member organizations, consists of a chairperson, vice chairperson, and six councilors, two from each of the three communities Z39 serves. The Z39 executive director and the representative from the Z39 Secretariat serve as ex-officio members of the Council. James L. Wood, Chemical Abstracts Service, is the current chairman, and Sally H. McCallum of the Library of Congress is the current vice chairman.

How Z39 is Supported: Since October, 1978, the National Bureau of Standards has contributed office space, equipment, and telephone, printing, and mailing services to Z39. Interim financial support is currently received from the Council on Library Resources, the National Science Foundation, NCLIS, and OCLC, Inc. However, CLR, NSF, and NCLIS have project-oriented funding policies which have reduced their ability to continue as major supporters of Z39.

For Z39 to remain a responsive and effective standards mechanism and to continue to build a program which is responsive to community needs, it must have adequate funding. Just as other ANSI Standards Committees are supported by the communities they serve, support for Z39 should come from libraries, information services, and publishers. Organizations which benefit from the activities of Z39 are now being asked to contribute funds to support Z39.

Two Draft Resolutions Attached: Two draft resolutions are attached for consideration at the White House Conference, directed at Federal, State, and local government agencies and organizations in the private sector, profit and non-profit, concerned with libraries, information services, and publishing. One resolution encourages more widespread use of national and international standards, and the other recommends support, including financial support, for the continued development of national and international standards.

ADDENDA:

Proposed Resolution:
Support for the Continued Development of National and International Technical Standards

Whereas, it is an established fact that library and information services will work many times more effectively and efficiently if technical and procedural standards are established and adopted by all information agencies providing information services; and

Whereas, the use of standards reduces the cost of information services; and

Whereas, the development of such standards is a national and international commitment; and

Whereas, recognized agencies such as the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), National Bureau of Standards (NBS), and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) already exist to facilitate the development of standards;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Federal, State, and local governments direct all Federal, State, and local government libraries, publishing and information services, and appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies to support and help to finance the development and review of national and international standards in the fields of libraries, information services, and related publishing practices, utilizing established and recognized procedures and institutions; and

Be it further resolved, that private agencies and foundations also be encouraged to participate in, support, and help to finance the development of such standards.

Proposed Resolution:
Use of National and International Technical Standards

Whereas, the use of appropriate national and international standards reduces the cost and improves the effectiveness of library and information services; and

Whereas, the acceptance and adoption of standards is only possible where knowledge and understanding of standards exists; and

Whereas, the library, information service, and publishing practices of Federal agencies, such as the Library of Congress and the National Libraries, the Government Printing Office, and the National Technical Information Service, have a profound influence on library and information services in the United States;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Federal, State, and local governments direct all Federal, State, and local government libraries, publishing and information services, and similar government supported activities, to play an exemplary role in the acceptance and use of established standards; and

Be it further resolved, that the Federal, State, and local governments support activities which lead to broader understanding and adoption of established standards throughout the Nation; and

Be it further resolved, that private agencies and foundations also be encouraged to accept and use and support activities leading to a broader understanding and adoption of established standards.

Henriette D. Avram
American National Standards Committee Z39

Testimony Submitted by Vivian S. Balester

Proposing the Establishment of a National Law Library

The United States needs a National Law Library to ensure the orderly acquisition, maintenance, and accessibility of all documents and materials essential to the jurisprudence and public life of this Nation and the world.

The National Law Library should be an independent agency, modeled after those other great national libraries, the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library. The superior collection and dissemination of legal information are no less essential to our national life and goals than those of medical and agricultural information. The public interest which the Nation and our people have in all governmental agreements, large and small, in national and State laws, and in the rules, regulations, and court decisions which affect our every action and relationship, is not well-served by the present system. The primary reason is that there is no National Law Library charged with the mission of collecting, maintaining, and providing access to the totality of local, national, and international legal information.

This mission is critical. As a people, we have a myriad of social, economic, and political problems dependent for solution on the resources and legal systems of a vastly shrunken world. We have national and international environmental problems which can even cause the death of this planet. Many of these problems are subject only to political solutions, but such solutions are planned and executed through legal agreements and decisions, ranging from handshakes between heads of states, to elaborate international treaties, to ordinances passed by village councils. Unfortunately, these agreements and other laws are not totally available and accessible anywhere in our country. State and municipal laws and regulations are probably less available than international ones to researchers working in a national legal system which is no longer truly jurisdictional. They should be available at one location to all people.

The existing Law Library of the Library of Congress, while straining staff and resources in the pursuit of a complete law collection since its statutory designation as a department in 1832, has not been able to perform this task even though it is probably the greatest law library in the world. Apparently this is due to structure. The Law Library is a department of the Library of Congress, which has often treated it and the discipline of law as a nuisance. Law as a field of knowledge was not classified by the Library of Congress for nearly 60 years from the date when classification was authorized in 1909, and it was the last major discipline to receive this essential scholarly analysis. The budget for the Law Library is now merged with the rest of the Library of Congress, with consequent loss of funds and accountability for the way funds are spent. There are plans to move congressional documents out of the Law Library, with the ultimate result that few if any legislative histories will be compiled by legal experts.

The Librarian of Congress has stated that he considers law to be merely one of several social sciences concerned with the interests and development of mankind which must be melded into the total body of recorded thought. In other words, primary legal materials should be commingled in the general collection. While plausible on a theoretical and intellectual basis, this philosophy will wreak havoc with the needs of the Nation as it governs itself and participates in world affairs.

Our irreplaceable national law collection must be managed according to patterns of use and the needs of the Nation's lawmakers and enforcers. Legal materials are dynamic action materials. Even ancient items may be instantly needed for the settlement of great and small legal disputes. They are not items to be so dispersed that they will be reasonably available only to retrospective scholars. The needs of the broad constituency of legislators, judges, public servants, and the practicing bar *must* be served before the needs of interdisciplinary scholarship are met.

The Librarian of Congress has proposed a reorganization of the Library of Congress which would help implement this unfortunate merger and perpetuate the neglect of legal materials. Such a reorganization would effectively destroy the Law Library as a national collection, since it would be delegated to a position under a Department of Research Services. It would no longer have its present distinct and unique status, would not be able to perform as efficiently as it has in the past, and would be placed in the terrible position of competing with collections of lesser importance for general library funds.

This risk must not be taken with such a valuable national resource. The reorganization proposal was postponed only because of outraged testimony by the legal and library communities before the congressional Joint Committee on the Library nearly two years ago, but it is still pending. Witnesses at the committee hearing, who testified in opposition to the reorganization, represented the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Facilities of the Law Library of Congress, the American Association of Law Schools, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Library of Congress United Association of Employees, and the Law Librarians' Society of the District of Columbia. Opposing witnesses who testified in their individual capacities included the chief of the American-British Law Division of the Library of Congress, the Librarian of the U.S. Department of Justice, and several past presidents of the American Association of Law Libraries, who are distinguished professors at national law schools or librarians at major law firms. While some of these called only indirectly for the creation of a separate facility for a National Law Library, they were united in their support of such a concept and in opposition to merging the Law Library into the administrative substructure of the Library of Congress.

The Librarian of Congress also persistently affirms that the Library is what it says it is—the Library of and for the Congress—and all other needs and goals are secondary to congressional usage. But, should congressional needs, while certainly great and probably paramount, be interpreted so as to constrict an issue of this magnitude? If access to these materials is so urgently needed by the Congress, which generates many of them, is it not then more desperately needed by the rest of the Nation upon whom the laws impact?

The establishment of a National Law Library would not preclude *priority* attention being given to the needs of the Congress and its Congressional Research Service, but would allow adequate and timely legal information and bibliographic services to be provided to the other two branches of national Government, to all levels of State and local government, and to the legal and lay publics. Being relieved from attempting to accomplish these time-related tasks would permit the Library of Congress to concentrate on its overall mission: to serve the Congress, to serve as the national registrar, to serve all the Nation's libraries in other and perhaps less urgent respects, and to serve the whole community of learning.

The law is much more than a scholarly or artistic discipline. It is the basis for action, the foundation of freedom, the contemporary illumination of our Constitution, and the ordinary mechanism which regulates and protects our lives, our properties, and our civil liberties. Our Nation's greatness has been measured in recent decades in terms of our being the progenitor and repositor of scientific information. Perhaps our greatness will once again, as in the early days of the Republic, come to be measured in terms of the legal information which we share with the rest of the world. This will not be possible if our current daily interpretations of those unparalleled documents, the U.S. Constitution, Bill of Rights, and U.S. Code, are buried in county courthouses and administrative offices for none to see. Nor will it be possible if significant national developments are available to just a powerful few because they are indexed or available in a timely sense only through expensive computer systems not accessible to all.

Intrinsic to our legal system is the idea that laws shall be officially recorded, preserved, and made accessible to everyone. Our system of justice further requires a wide dissemination and awareness of these laws and regulations. We have no provision or place for secret laws or for those whose inaccessibility impede compliance. To the extent that our laws and regulations are unknown due to inadequate bibliographic control and access, they are as effectively secret as if deliberately suppressed.

A National Law Library could do much to prevent this by assuming responsibilities for a collection truly national and international in scope. The times call for innovation, and the establishment of a law library with a statutory mandate to serve the Nation would be a monumental and historic step. One has only to look at the accomplishments of the National Library of Medicine for confirmation. Doubts of efficacy surely existed before that library was founded, but the tremendous strides in health care during the past 25 years are due in significant part to the wide dissemination of medical and scientific information by this library.

The dual responsibility of the National Law Library would be similar: to develop a national collection, *and* to provide keys to its contents. Many endeavors would be involved: cataloging of legal materials; cooperation with other major law libraries here and abroad; adoption and enforcement of standards for legal indexing and bibliography; maintenance of a bibliographic structure flexible enough to accommodate all law-related information regardless of its output rate or volume; acquisition and immediate coordination of national and international commercial laws and regulations, in recognition of the fact that American mercantile interests find it exceedingly difficult to conduct business transnationally. They are, by necessity, forced into a burgeoning international "law merchant" more reminiscent of medieval Europe than of a technologically advanced civilization. (Business interests and their legal counsel now must pursue up-to-date trade and legal information in dozens of different departments in several different Federal agencies. This unavailability of information necessary to our interests is absurd when we rather freely make our technological information available to other nations with competing economic interests.)

It would be the responsibility of the National Law Library to enhance the administration of justice and the pursuit of commerce by implementing these and many more ideas to serve the needs of legal researchers. Each member of the legal community is an individual researcher engaged in seeking information toward active ends, and only on occasion researching to write passive commentary. No individual researcher, or local law library, can cope unaided any longer with the explosion of legal publications, be these court opinions, administrative rules, or statutes or treaties. The similar explosions in fields necessary to contemporary legal analysis, such as human rights, energy, and environment only compound the problem.

To serve legal researchers, law library service is different from that of most libraries. It is usually needed for immediate purposes; it is literature-dependent, and the literature is different from that of other disciplines. Its bibliography is also different and must be current to the moment. Law librarianship is also different; it functions optimally in a library devoted solely to legal and law-related services where skills are constantly enhanced, and where a complete grasp of the relevant subject matter and bibliography can be attained by staff having a professional commitment.

Because of these factors, the present Law Library already has a unique relationship with the public that no other department of the Library of Congress has. It maintains a direct relationship with other law libraries and this assists in the overall administration of justice. This relationship must be enhanced and expanded to encompass a national network of law libraries having the National Law Library as a central repository charged with collection of all relevant materials, bibliographic control, and dissemination of information about its holdings.

Law libraries exist all over our land. They must be unified to enhance retrieval and the development of sound legal principles, and to effect substantial financial economies for the whole Nation. The needs of the country outside Washington, D.C., are not being met, and they must be if we are to realize effective equal access to legal information for all people.

The American Bar Association, assembled in convention in February, 1979, passed a unanimous resolution which deplored and opposed the ongoing and proposed policies of the Library of Congress toward the Law Library, and reaffirmed its support of the separate departmental status of the Law Library. In its accompanying report, it urged that immediate thought and study be given to the establishment of a National Law Library as an autonomous entity. Other responsible organizations which can speak knowledgeably on this topic have made similar recommendations by testimony or publication.

Therefore, I propose the following:

1) that a National Law Library be established by the Congress of the United States;

2) that the Law Library of the Library of Congress be the nucleus of the National Law Library;

3) that the physical facility of this library be located as closely as possible to the United States Capitol and the Supreme Court of the United States, so that the library can continue to serve these bodies as conveniently as in the past;

4) that the Congress make findings and declare as broad and all-inclusive a policy for the National Law Library as it found and declared for the National Library of Medicine in 1956, and as it has consistently refined and reaffirmed since that time as set forth in *42 U.S.C. 280b*. A paraphrase of this code section, redrafted to pertain to the mission of the National Law Library, could read as follows:

________ U.S.C. ________ Congressional Findings and
Declarations of Policy
Authorization of Appropriations

(a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that: (1) the unprecedented expansion of legal information within the past two decades has brought about a massive growth in the quantity, and major changes in the nature of, legal information, materials, and publications; (2) there has not been a corresponding growth in the facilities and techniques necessary to adequately coordinate and disseminate among members of government and the judiciary, the legal profession and the public the ever-increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been developed; (3) much of the value of this ever-increasing volume of knowledge which has been, and continues to be, promulgated as law and regulations will be lost or not properly implemented unless proper measures are taken in the immediate future to develop facilities and techniques necessary to collect, preserve, store, process, retrieve, and facilitate the dissemination and utilization of such law and other legal materials.

(b) It is therefore the policy of this part to—

(1) assist in the training of law librarians and other legal information specialists;

(2) assist, through grants to knowledgeable members of the legal system, and to public or nonprofit private institutions on the behalf of such members and others, in the compilation of existing, and the creation of additional, written matter which will facilitate the distribution and utilization of knowledge and information relating to law, jurisprudence, and government;

(3) assist in the conduct of research, investigations, and demonstrations in the field of law library science and related activities, and in the development of new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing legal information;

(4) assist in establishing, expanding, and improving the basic resources of law libraries and related facilities;

(5) assist in the development of a national system of regional law libraries each of which would have facilities of sufficient depth and scope to supplement the services of other law libraries within the region served by it; and

(6) provide financial support in the public interest to legal publications and computerized information systems.

These recommendations are consistent with the goals and purposes of the proposed National Library Act, currently under study by the Congress. The need is great if justice is to be served. The time is now.

Vivian S. Balester

Testimony Submitted by
Thomas C. Battle

Minority Group Needs for Public Library Service:
A Statement in Support of the National Library Act

My name is Thomas C. Battle. I am acting director of the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center at Howard University in Washington, D.C. I want to talk to you today about the importance of public libraries and the availability of meaningful public library services to America's minority groups—not the waves of immigrants who flooded to our shores in the late 19th and early 20th centuries—but the descendants of immigrants who were brought here in chains or who came in poverty and want to learn and understand the values of our society and the roles they can play within our society. These are the minorities in America which have traditionally suffered from the problems of illiteracy, high unemployment, and inability to speak English or to command it well.

More than 200 years have passed since Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues at Philadelphia asserted as a self-evident truth that "All men are created equal." And, while this equality has not been realized effectively, its vigorous pursuit continues. Ironically, though, our computer-based, highly industrialized society and increasingly benevolent government have made equality harder to achieve for many citizens than it appeared for most in the simpler setting of the 18th century. To realize "equal opportunity" in present-day America, one needs to be able to find where the opportunities are and to be able to utilize them to one's best advantage. This often demands more knowledge, skills, and sophistication than some of our most educated citizens possessed two centuries ago.

A number of government and private programs have attempted to bridge the gap between the so-called "advantaged" and the so-called "disadvantaged." Few have succeeded. The result is that countless Americans live in worlds of ignorance and poverty.

The public library offers an avenue for compensatory education and for academic reinforcement. Just as a college or university library must provide curriculum support to maximize the effectiveness of the educational process, so too must public libraries support public education efforts. In this way it truly becomes the university of the people and for the people who need it most—the educationally disadvantaged and impoverished.

While public libraries do not possess any panacea for the paradox of greater inequality today than earlier in our history, they do provide some powerful weapons for dealing with it. With their decentralized network of branches to serve local communities, with librarians professionally trained in the skills of organizing and maintaining reference materials, and with already established collections of backup resources, public libraries are the logical community agencies to provide across-the-board information and referral services, as well as support for literacy programs.

The thousands of public libraries across the Nation are the logical resources to bring to the task of correcting educational inequality and improving job and social skills. Public libraries can supply needed information, improve literacy, provide guidance, and heighten self-assurance for those who are at the bottom end of the economic and educational ladder. Innovative librarians and creative community leaders have already shown the way. The challenge for the rest of us is to fashion a lasting program. The thought that libraries are frills and the failure to provide library services for our citizens in a meaningful way are an indictment of our society.

The problem is that traditional library services tend to reach only the better-educated and more stable members of minority communities. For all practical purposes, these services are largely unavailable to the great majority of residents of underprivileged areas. We must realize that during legalized segregation, there was no dual library system providing for the needs of Blacks, particularly, and that libraries have often been located in areas generally inaccessible to Blacks and other minorities, with materials often irrelevant to the needs of these user groups.

Libraries have found that if they are to reach the disadvantaged members of their communities, they must use their resources in innovative ways. Language barriers, cultural barriers, low-reading levels, and simple mistrust prevent many poverty-area people from recognizing the library as a resource capable of boosting them up to jobs and a better life.

While we must provide opportunities for the institutionalized and the economically and educationally disadvantaged, it is not fair to place the financial burden of developing and using new library resources to help these disadvantaged primarily on the taxpayers of the community where chance has brought the need. The cost should be borne by a broader base, and that is why we urgently need a new National Library Act, and need it funded as well and as soon as possible. The Javits/Kennedy Study Bill for a proposed new National Library Act provides for special library services to the illiterate, unemployed, disabled, handicapped, and institutionalized—those who most need it—not necessarily minorities, but inordinately so.

I urge this White House Conference, which was first proposed more than 20 years ago and which has enjoyed the active support of four Presidents, to help us all to realize the American dream of equality by actively supporting the needs of minorities for substantive public library services and for a new National Library Act.

Thomas C. Battle

Testimony Submitted by Ivan R. Bender

On January 1, 1978, the first general revision of the United States Copyright Law since 1909 became effective. The new legislation (P.L. 94-553) was widely hailed as one which brought the United States copyright laws up to date in an era of technological developments.

One area of the new law which required careful negotiation by the various interest groups concerns reprography of all kinds as it affects libraries and library users. It is not surprising, therefore, that the interest of the Copyright Office in this Conference is quite intense. We hope that by means of this paper, and through discussions among staff people of the Copyright Office and with persons attending the Conference in official capacities, we will be able to make you aware of our concerns, and that we will become more aware of yours.

Section 108 of the Copyright Law, entitled "Limitations on Exclusive Rights: Reproduction by Libraries and Archives," is the center of our focus for purposes of the White House Conference. This provision of the law enables libraries and users of libraries to reproduce copies of phonograph records of certain works under certain terms and conditions. As you might well imagine, representatives of authors and publishers of copyrighted works, and representatives of librarians, and users of libraries spent a considerable amount of time discussing the various issues involved and in testifying before the Congress in an attempt to secure the best resolution of a difficult problem. The final language of this section of the law is a cooperative effort by those interest groups and the Congress.

Without a doubt, a new concept in the law was being developed. Nobody who was involved with this effort was completely happy with the final result, which perhaps is the best indicator of a successful compromise. But like all compromises, some things do not work out in practice as well as they should for one side or the other; and so the Congress, aware of possible unforseen problems, as well as the desire to be kept apprised of developments in this area, created language which mandates that the Register of Copyrights, at five-year intervals beginning with the effective date of the law, issue a report to the Congress on this section. The first of these reports is due on January 1, 1983.

Ivan R. Bender
U.S. Copyright Office

Testimony Submitted by James E. Beverly

The Carter administration has proposed an Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation (ISTC), formerly called the Institute for Technological Cooperation. The dual purpose of the ISTC is to: 1) "strengthen capacities of developing countries seeking to apply science and technology to meet their needs"; and 2) "focus increased scientific and technological research attention on the search for better ways to meet basic human needs and approach global problems." (From ITC "Congressional Presentation" document, dated February 23, 1979.) The ISTC legislation is now pending in the Congress.

One of the 10 major program areas of the proposed ISTC is "Communications and Information Systems." Specific system tasks identified include: "tapping sources of scientific and technical information in other countries," and "disseminating information on improved productive practices, health measures, etc., to the local population."

These tasks are consistent with the Conference theme on "Increasing International Cooperation and Understanding," which includes cultural exchange, science and technology exchange, trade information, and personal information exchange.

The ISTC has been authorized by the Congress, but there has been controversy over its funding and appropriation. The ISTC legislation is part of the foreign aid package now in the Conference Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

It is suggested that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services endorse the ISTC and urge the Congress to follow up its authorization with the appropriations needed to fund the ISTC operations.

ADDENDUM:

Excerpts from "Congressional Presentation"
by the Institute for Technological Cooperation
February 23, 1979

Preface

> *"For the rest of this century, the greatest potential for growth is in the developing world. To become more self-reliant, developing nations need to strengthen their technological capabilities. To assist them, I am proposing a new United States foundation for technological collaboration.*
>
> *"Through private and public foundations and through our increasing participation in the United Nations conferences, we can make technical and scientific cooperation a key element in our relationship."*

Jimmy Carter
Address to the
Congress of
Venezuela
March 29, 1978

> *". . . the Congress declares that a principal objective of the foreign policy of the United States is the encouragement and sustained support of the people of developing countries in their efforts to acquire the knowledge and resources essential to development and to build the economic, political, and social institutions which will improve the quality of their lives."*

Enacted by Congress as
Section 101, Chapter I of
Part I of the Foreign
Assistance Act of 1961,
as amended.
October 6, 1978

Contents

I. Summary Statement

II. FY 1980 Budget Summary

III. Background Discussion
  - The Importance of Science and Technology to Development
  - Development Assistance Experience with Technology
  - The Role of Research and Development
  - The Need for Technological Cooperation

IV. Description of IFTC
  A. Purpose and Functions of IFTC
  B. Organization and Programming

V. Program Description
  A. Summary
  B. Problem Area Discussion and Illustrative Projects
    1. Increasing Agricultural Productivity and Rural Income
    2. Improving Health Conditions in Developing Areas
    3. Improving Population Programs
    4. Nutritional Improvement
    5. Strengthening Indigenous Science and Technology Capacity
    6. Improved Processes of Technological Cooperaton
    7. Communications and Information Systems
    8. Energy Planning and New Energy Supplies
    9. Environmental Protection and Natural Resource Management
    10. Non-Agricultural Employment

VI. Special Concerns
  A. Why a Semi-Autonomous Institute?
  B. Criteria and Tentative List of Projects for Transfer from AID

Summary Statement: In March, 1978, President Carter proposed a new institution for scientific and technological cooperation with developing countries. That initiative, the Institute for Technological Cooperation (IFTC), fills a need frequently expressed by developing country spokesmen and builds on the recognized strength of this country in science and technology. It will add an effective new means of responding to the changing circumstances of the Third World in support of our national policies.

The Institute has a dual purpose: 1) to strengthen capacities of developing countries seeking to apply science and technology to meet their needs; and 2) to focus increased scientific and technological research attention on the search for better ways to meet basic human needs and approach global problems.

Justification: As part of the overall development assistance program, but separate in its structure and focus, IFTC strengthens the nation's ability to respond to several critical needs in line with U.S. policy:

It mobilizes the scientific and technological talent of the U.S., both public and private, to address the critical problems of poverty and disease, and those of global concern, for example, natural resources and environmental planning. At present, only about one percent of the world's civilian R&D expenditures are devoted directly to the problems of the poorest half of the world's people.

It *increases the efficiency* of assistance programs, bilateral and multilateral, by sustained, professional attention to gaps in our knowledge about small-farm food production, tropical disease control, and other problems inhibiting the effective use of aid. At present, the crops grown by the world's poorer farmers are the least known; vaccines effective in the temperate zone are failing in the tropical regions where the poor live, for reasons yet unknown.

It aims at building the problem-solving capacity of the developing countries themselves, particularly the capacity to select and adapt technologies relevant to their needs. The use of inappropriate technologies has widened the gap between rich and poor and deprived the people of developing countries of productive employment opportunities.

It provides a means for *testing, adapting, and bringing to the stage of application* technologies appropriate to the needs of the people in developing countries.

It provides for a *new relationship with advancing, "middle-tier" countries, not based on concessional aid,* but through a cost-shared partnership in which their skills and resources are joined with ours to solve problems of development. Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia are examples of countries where such cooperation would be mutually beneficial.

It provides a *focal point in the U.S. Government* for examining all R&D done in U.S. agencies of relevance to development and for linking such programs to international systems of information and communication so that this work has wider benefit.

It provides a means of *engaging the private sector* more directly in meeting the needs in developing countries.

Relationship to AID: IFTC will be supportive of and coordinated with AID through the International Development Cooperation Administration, and the use of joint working committees and field arrangements. IFTC is distinguished from AID in: 1) its primary focus on finding new and better ways to apply science and technology for development; and 2) its promotion of technological cooperation on both development problems of the poor and global problems such as environment, energy, and natural resource development which affect the U.S. and developing countries.

Staff and Structure: The Institute will have a small, highly professional staff. Much of it will be on term appointments and borrowed from the private sector, other government agencies, universities, and research institutions. Experts from developing countries will be included in both the staff and the Advisory Council.

Rather than directly operate programs itself, IFTC will make grants or sign contracts with those institutions in developing countries, in the private sector, and the science community that can do the job. About 75 percent of its funds will be spent in the developing countries. It will act largely as a catalyst to bring together those interested and working on development problems so that efficiency is achieved.

Current Efforts: The use of radio for development purposes, including AID supported projects in mathematics teaching in Nicaraguan schools and informing farmers and their families in Guatemala, has recently demonstrated new potential for the contribution of media to the rural poor. The requirements of successful media projects are becoming better understood.

Major donor programs encompass field experiments and applications of media, as well as policy and cost studies at the sectoral and project levels. The development banks fund telecommunications infrastructure investments, although largely on commercial (rather than "basic needs") criteria.

UNESCO has stressed national communications policy-making. AID has recently begun a six-year initiative to test the utility of satellite communications to rural basic needs-oriented development.

FY 1980 Budget: The FY 1980 budget request is for *$25 million.* Approximately 20 percent of this will be concentrated on problems of food; 25 percent on health, population, and nutrition; 25 percent on specific programs for technological capacity-building and cooperation including communications and information systems; 18 percent on problems of energy, environment, and natural resources; and 12 percent on non-agricultural employment. Careful program planning will be done throughout the first year, as well as active starts made in projects where the preparations are already in place. Long-range research programs now financed by AID will also be transferred to IFTC.

Communications and Information Systems

Introduction: Rapid communication and reliable information handling systems are vital to the functioning of modern society. Improving media and data processing capabilities must be a necessary adjunct to building a national capacity for understanding and dealing with problems. Communication and information systems are essential to a wide range of development tasks, including the following: 1) gathering and processing data on prices, outputs, transfers, etc. in order to make sensible policy decisions; 2) tapping sources of scientific and technical information in other countries; 3) disseminating information on improved productive practices, health measures, etc. to the local population; 4) coordinating the functions of government; 5) educating people in school and out; and 6) disseminating information on the policies of government.

Despite a veritable explosion in technology for these purposes in developed countries, the adaptations to the developing countries, especially to the needs of the majority, have been quite limited. Overcoming the obstacles to better use of such technology could have impact in every sector of development.

Background: Technical advance in the fields of communications, information gathering and information handling have been tremendous in the industrialized countries in recent decades. Satellites, computers, microfilm, and many other advances have enormously increased the ready availability of information. The potential benefit to developing countries from these advances would seem to be enormous, but, as with other technologies, the fact that they were developed for advanced country purposes creates difficulties in their transfer. In some cases, use of advanced communications and information systems can widen the gap between the modern and traditional sectors of developing countries.

In the case of radio, for example, a proliferation of broadcasting has occurred as transistors lowered costs and increased access to radio reception. But the upsurge of media use has often been prompted by political or commercial motives and the results have not necessarily advanced the development process.

The technological frontier is advancing so rapidly, however, that communications may be the only major factor in the development process with a declining future cost curve. Lower costs related to mass media may in the long run offer the best chance of providing the information necessary to improve the lives of the people outside the major cities in developing countries. It may also offer the best chance of keeping them outside the major cities, by helping to make rural life more attractive.

For the development potential of this technology to be attained, more attention is needed to be given to adaptive research and experimentation with effective media applications.

Modern technology in the fields of communications and information is very expensive, and the political and economic interests involved are powerful, so the IFTC will need to exercise caution in deciding what it can realistically try to accomplish.

The Institute's Program: Initially, an intensive planning effort will be undertaken to identify strategies for increasing the contribution of communications and information technology to development. Planning activities will focus on the following areas:

1) *Mass media applications* constitute the most heavily researched area to date. Basic principles for structuring a successful project are known, as are practical methods for planning, message design, pre-testing, evaluation and administration of media. IFTC activities will ensure that this knowledge is effectively disseminated and utilized by those undertaking new projects.

2) *Specialized information services* are increasingly available to developing countries through catalogs and mailing systems, and even remote computer terminals. However, there are serious questions regarding the conditions under which such information is really used, or can really be useful. In order to ensure that developing country needs and conditions are adequately considered, mechanisms for filtering information and for incorporating particular information needs should be developed. Experience with developing countries' use of existing systems should also be studied. This subject will be discussed at the UN Conference on Science and Technology for Development and specific project ideas will emerge from those discussions.

3) *Appropriate hardware* for use in arid and tropical environments by users from nontechnological cultures is an important subject for R&D. Adaptation of technologies ranging from audio cassette recorders and small radio transmitters to simple printing presses and locally producible paper should be probed. Use of pictorial rather than language instruction should be promoted for nonliterate populations and multi-lingual situations. R&D now underway concerning larger technologies, such as satellites, ground stations, and micro-processor-based equipment should also be followed and assessed.

4) *Delivery systems* have not been effective in developing countries. New approaches to training, use of media, and other elements are urgently needed to move known technology to the users. IFTC will initiate special efforts to analyze problems and promote improvements.

5) *New information infrastructures* are on the horizon. New generations of satellites and new digital techniques may allow for integrated development of post, telephone, broadcasting and data communications. However, such technologies are not yet operational

even in the industrial countries. In view of the particular constraints existing in developing countries, different investment alternatives (from the technologically conservative to the most adventurous) must be assessed very critically, under different assumptions regarding future cost curves and equipment availability and reliability.

6) *Policy research* becomes extremely important, as major technological options are considered, and as political leaders require national communications policies. Methods for conducting policy-oriented research need further development. Investigation of the developmental impacts of entertainment and information media and of the telephone is of great importance to developing countries in the guiding of future investments by their governments.

Planned FY 1980 Budget

Project Initiatives: Projects in cooperation with the AID communication satellite initiative, especially regarding development of lower-cost technology for disseminating programs to the populace.	$1.0 million
Intensive Planning Activities: Specialized Information Systems Mass Media Applications Communications Policy Research	$1.0 million
Total	$2.0 million

Communications and Information
Illustrative Project

Title: Specialized Information Services.

Purpose: To examine the means to improve the utility of modern information systems for development purposes.

Background: Information gathering and handling technology has advanced spectacularly in recent years as a result of the development of computers, satellites, and electronic data processing systems. The potential value to developing countries of the extensive data bases which have been amassed to make use of the new technologies would seem to be very great. High expectations also surround potential applications of remote sensing data (particularly from LANDSAT) and of computer software packages.

However, these technologies are extremely difficult to use successfully even in developed countries. To make these technologies productive, there must be large institutional users with relatively stable and competent operations which have very specific problems to solve, and adequate resources with which to solve them. Most developing countries may lack this institutional base of users. They may also be plagued by rather basic technical problems, such as unstable power supplies, lack of spare parts, etc. In addition, the manpower demands of operating specialized information services may exceed the capacities of many smaller or poorer countries.

Even if these constraints are circumvented, the results could be disappointing. To the extent that these problems can be surmounted, urban, modern institutions may be the major beneficiaries. Thus, specialized information services could widen the gap between traditional and modern sectors, unless vigorous efforts are undertaken to tailor the technology to the needs of development. There is a pressing need to examine the means by which governments and other institutions seeking to improve the conditions of the poor can use these services.

FY 80 Intensive Planning Activities: IFTC will, in collaboration with developing countries, undertake an indepth analysis of the conditions under which information systems can be effectively employed for development purposes. The results of this analysis will be considered at a workshop of information users and information scientists. Growing out of the workshop will be a plan for pilot information projects in selected fields for implementation in FY 81 and thereafter.

James E. Beverly

Testimony Submitted by John A. Bowser

I am John A. Bowser, Executive Director of the Philadelphia Urban Coalition. The Philadelphia Urban Coalition is a nonprofit social service agency, financially supported by 102 Philadelphia area corporations at a level of approximately $1 million annually. In addition, the Urban Coalition enjoys an effective relationship with all levels of government and receives about $800,000 in grants from governmental agencies directed toward improving services and the quality of life of Philadelphia's disadvantaged citizens. The Coalition is led by a 65-member prestigious board of directors from business, labor, government, community organizations, and industry. I am appreciative of this opportunity to testify, specifically on behalf of Philadelphia's urban poor, and generally on behalf of the urban poor throughout our country.

The growth and development of our country has thrived on the premise of a universal education and the expectation that every citizen in the United States could and should make a positive contribution to society. We have not displayed a "rich only" sign and have historically supported a "rags to riches" performance and rewarded the ethics of hard work. The dilemmas facing the quality of life of urban poor are tremendous. They are devastated by spiralling inflation, rising interest rates, and higher levels of unemployment in our older cities than the national average unemployment rate reflects. The quality of life and the quality of services provided by cities, which are heavily dependent upon a shrinking tax base, decline sharply in our energy-sensitive, inflationary-oriented economy. The

White House Conference on Library and Information Services offers a unique opportunity to surface the issue that older cities, which unfortunately are heavily populated with the urban poor, are unable to maintain full-service and accessible neighborhood library facilities, as well as a full range of other data and information services. We must not deny these Americans, these unfortunate urbanites—and, as a consequence, deny our country—continued growth and innovation because of the problems of a shrinking tax base.

The minds of all Americans and their exposure and availability to information must not be denied. The need for Federal funding intervention is now; it is necessary, it is practical, it is the only means of continuing the true meaning of universal education. The "rich only" sign has never been the American way. An underdeveloped mind is as important to our national security and economic growth as an underdeveloped country.

The older urban cities do face huge problems in achieving a quality standard of living for all their citizens. Their financial inability to maintain a library and information service should not mean that these services disappear from the inner-city neighborhoods of our older cities.

I urge the White House Conference on Library and Information Services to endorse direct Federal financial support to libraries, especially those in older cities, where an objective measure of poverty and disadvantaged living can be determined. It is my belief that such a proposal would be supported in the pride that we have in the general level of intellect of Americans as compared with other nations of the world. This is important to our country and necessary to all of its citizens. Thank you very much for this opportunity.

John A. Bowser
Philadelphia Urban Coalition

Testimony Submitted by Stuart Carothers

I welcome the opportunity to appear before an open hearing of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. I have felt a sense of involvement for several weeks since, at our headquarters in New York City, we have been putting on tape for blind delegates some of the fascinating material being sent out in preparation for the Conference. Let me first tell you something about Recording for the Blind, and then describe our new library program.

Background Information About RFB: Recording for the Blind is a *national* educational organization meeting a critical need for visually, physically, and perceptually handicapped students and professionals. It is the only national library that provides free-on-loan, tape recorded books for educational purposes to thousands of handicapped Americans at every academic level. Since its founding in 1951, more than 53,000 men, women, and children in every State have used RFB's services—learning by ear—to prepare for independent, self-sustaining careers as teachers, social workers, ministers, engineers, mechanics, security analysts, and business people. RFB's library of spoken words—the largest educational resource of its kind in the world—makes possible for them a productive future.

RFB's constantly expanding master tape library contains over 50,000 titles (over one million recorded hours) on topics as varied as astrophysics, macroeconomics, and art history. With the dedicated assistance of highly trained volunteers, working in 29 RFB recording studios throughout the country, the master tape library is growing at the rate of 400 titles per month. Last year alone, RFB filled from our headquarters in New York City requests from more than 13,000 borrowers for nearly 90,000 texts.

Subject Reference System: The National Endowment for the Humanities recently made a substantial grant to RFB to create a system for subject search of the titles in RFB's master tape library, using key and subject words, annotations, and text abstract information. For the first time, blind and print-handicapped students and professionals wishing to do research will have a quick, dependable mechanism for searching the taped material available to them.

Let me explain. While RFB has a strong record of providing educational texts to the Nation's visually handicapped, we have historically been able to answer requests for books only by author and title. As the aspirations of the blind grow, requests for RFB's books grow apace at an average of 10 percent annually, and we increasingly receive inquiries from both student and professional users for material on specific *subject* areas. Blind and print-handicapped students and professionals are doing more research for courses, theses, and dissertations, and RFB must be able to respond to their requests. Professional users as well need this capability. As a result, RFB plans to:

- Catalogue all its titles in MARC format with the assistance of the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped of the Library of Congress. (Let me add, parenthetically, that the services of RFB and the National Library Service complement each other—NLS concentrating on recreational reading and RFB on educational.)

- We will then augment these records to facilitate search.

- We will put our catalogue in the Bibliographic Retrieval Services, so RFB's bibliography can be searched at any of the system's terminals.

- We will combine this cataloguing system with taped books from other collections.

It is important that blind and print-handicapped students and professionals across the country, as well as librarians and educators, become aware of the capability RFB is developing. We would like to hear from any of you who have suggestions about how we can improve our services.

This morning the President referred to the frequent isolation of the handicapped from library services and the printed word. Title IV of the proposed National Library Act addresses this problem directly by proposing funding of special services to the handicapped. I cannot leave this hearing without urging that this Conference recommend that means be developed so that the U.S. Government can help defray the operational costs of private libraries like RFB, which fill a critical and unique function and have proven track records of serving the visually handicapped in all 50 States.

Stuart Carothers
Recording for the Blind

Testimony Submitted by
John A. Clayton

A Proposal
for an International Freedom of Information Exchange
To Be Offered by the United States Government

May I first express my appreciation for the opportunity you have afforded me to present a suggestion, an idea. I represent no group, no constituency, no organization; I am here as a private citizen of the United States of America. If my appearance here has any value, it may well lie chiefly in the fact that once again our society is presenting evidence that—despite the size and complexity of our country—we have yet managed to sustain those systems which permit the individual to be heard, that participatory government is a reality rather than a slogan.

Those in attendance at this Conference are interested in ideas and, by profession, in the ideas of others. After all, we go to a book or to a film, to a library or to a theatre not to find out what we already know or have experienced ourselves, but to find out what others have thought and experienced. And many here have dedicated their professional lives to making it possible for each of us to have access to what others think and to what others have learned.

Our very survival, the survival of the human race, is predicated upon our capacity to share experience. There are those who would believe that our concern with the free exchange of ideas, of opinion, of experience, of information is based upon sentimentality, that it is a luxury, or that it has value chiefly to the scholar. And there are those who believe that such freedom of information is dangerous to our continued survival. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The American belief in the free access to thought is neither sentimental nor a luxury, nor is it a policy promoted for the benefit of the scholar alone. It is our pragmatic experience that our growth as a Nation and our survival as a people have been directly related to our willingness to share our ideas with one another, with all people, and that we have benefited from the process.

My professional career was begun in the field of radio broadcasting, a field made possible by the work of Maxwell of Scotland, Hertz of Germany, Marconi of Italy, Branley of France, Lodge of England, Fessenden of Canada, and the Americans Morse and Alexanderson. The directing techniques I used were introduced by Stanislavsky, a Russian. The list could well go on. My professional life was made possible by the willingness of others to share their experiences. It was made possible because my society gave me access to that information.

The American society and the American strength were formed, not only through the immigration of peoples, but through the immigration of ideas. Both the people and the ideas were foreign until we made them our own, American. This is our heritage, the creation of a society open to the ideas and the contributions of the world. We must continue to build upon that heritage.

To contribute toward that endeavor, I should like to propose that the Government of the United States of America offer to the countries of the world the unrestricted use of a dedicated UHF channel to present their views, culture, priorities, and opinions to the American people so that we may have a better understanding of how they perceive themselves and the world in which we live together.

In our role of leadership in the free world, it is imperative that we understand the point-of-view of others if we are to deal realistically with them. Scholars, reporters, and government agencies seek to fulfill their obligations to the American public by presenting these differing national viewpoints, but inescapably their reports are colored by our own culture and our own priorities. Informed opinion is best achieved through first hand experience. How do they view themselves? Let them tell us. What problems do they perceive? What solutions do they propose? Let us listen to them.

Of course there will be some (there always are) who will feel that the American people need to be protected from the influence of foreign opinion, propaganda, lies, distortions, or, in some cases, even the truth. Yet even propaganda has a value in communicating how others view (or wish to view) the world we live in. As for its validity, I think we can do no better than follow in such matters the advice of Thomas Jefferson, who might well have been referring to television, but was, in fact, referring to the medium of his day, the book, when he wrote, "If it be false in its facts, disprove them; if false in its reasoning, refute it. But, for God's sake, let us freely hear both sides." The question is, are we the American people willing to hear both sides? Or perhaps, more precisely, are the gate-keepers and representatives of the American people willing for us to hear both sides?

That there are risks in allowing others to address our people without restriction is self-evident. We can be misled, fooled, our passions aroused. We are human. But let us be clear as to the nature of the risk. We are not proposing to trust others; we are proposing to trust ourselves. That is the nature of the American experiment in government. We make no claim as to the infallibility of our people; we do claim that our system of government presupposes the right of the American people to determine their own destiny, and that in the exercise of that right, access to information is essential. Long ago, the Greek leader, Pericles, understood the requirements of a free society when he contrasted the restrictions placed upon foreigners in Sparta with the open society of Athens where, as he said, "We trust less in system than to the native integrity of our people."

Of course, in the world in which we live, trust is very rare, and it is not surprising that nationals from other countries find it difficult to believe that we practice what we preach. They scoff at our claim to free expression as a fiction, protesting that our news and our views are carefully tailored to disguise the truth from the public. A strong argument for providing a public, unrestricted television channel for the presentation of national viewpoints other than our own is that it will represent dramatic, easily understood, and irrefutable evidence of the American commitment to freedom. Its emphatic statement will be that we do, in fact, practice what we preach, that we are unafraid, that we trust ourselves.

To do this I would propose the following:

1) That the people of the United States make it possible for everyone who owns a television set in the United States to have access to a channel that carries whatever message or content other nations wish to make available to the American people.

2) That the people of the United States offer to the nations of the world the unrestricted use (so far as content is concerned) of these channels, so that they may present their views, opinions, culture, counsel, advice, observations, experiences, or criticisms without modification or censorship by any agency, public or private, of the United States.

3) That the use of these channels be available to the legal representatives of any nation recognized as legitimate by the United Nations without regard to diplomatic recognition by the United States and without regard to our judgment as to whether that representation is salutary or pernicious.

4) That we provide such access even if a state of war exists between us in the belief that the more severe the stress, the more important it will be to hear and understand opposing points of view.

5) That use of the channel or channels be restricted only by the availability of time and the need to provide equitable opportunity to all nations.

6) That an appropriate commission be appointed by the President of the United States and funded by the Congress to achieve these objectives.

You will, perhaps, have noticed that I have presented an idea, rather than the details of its implementation. There are reasons for this. First, I am appearing here as an individual, with the resources of an individual, and the question of implementation will raise many questions beyond my individual competency.

Second, and a more compelling reason for not examining detail, is that discussion of detail can easily obscure the question, which is, simply, do we as a people wish to provide a television channel so that other nations may address us directly and without restriction? That is the question. If we do not, then obviously there is no need to examine the details of how to achieve that objective. If we do, then the details are merely problems to be solved, not arguments (because of their inevitable difficulty) against the achievement of our purpose.

Questions of detail might involve such matters as the practical limitations of availability of UHF channels, the process by which facilities would be made available, and whether the offer should be limited to access to the channel or should include broadcasting and production facilities. It is possible to argue that only reciprocal agreements should be considered, although this would clearly limit our capacity to inform our own people or to take advantage of a public demonstration of our own willingness to conduct an open society.

Yet this is not the forum for such an examination. Rather, I believe, it is our role to consider what recommendations and what policies we would like to endorse for the consideration of those who bear the responsibility for transforming the American dream into an American reality.

In presenting this idea, it is my hope that those of you whose lives are dedicated to the preservation and dissemination of the hopes and dreams and experiences of all mankind will find in this small proposal some contribution toward your endeavor, and that this Conference will recommend its approval and support.

John S. Clayton

Testimony Submitted by Cecily Cocco

My name is Cecily Cocco, and I am an alternate from the great State of California, president of the California Association of Library Trustees and Commissioners, and chairman of the Lake County Library Advisory Board.

What image do you conjure up when you visualize the rural library user? Many of us have traditionally fought the stereotype of the "country hayseed" who comes to a conference such as this one with a stalk of grain firmly implanted between his teeth! I myself firmly resisted the offer of a "Where the Hell is Lakeport, California?" t-shirt to drive my point home!

No stereotype could be further from the truth. And, in fact, no stereotypes apply here, since the rural designation transcends age, ethnic persuasion, and economic conditions. The common theme running through rural concerns is, in my estimation, a sense of isolation.

I concur with the California delegation's reaffirmation of the American tradition of a free and open institution for information, education, and culture known as the public library in the following areas:

1) Libraries are obligated to reach out to the unserved and underserved. All barriers to such service, whether legal, fiscal, technological, attitudinal, or physical, or any other barriers, must be eliminated. Physical facilities and staff must be capable of providing services to all segments of society.

2) There is need for mandated guaranteed continuous Federal, State, and local funding for libraries, with the understanding that the implementation of programs and services will be cost-effective. Libraries and information services should make every effort to cooperate and coordinate their services to avoid overlapping and duplication. Minimum standards for library services must be established, and local agencies continue to administer library services.

Your ideas of minimum standards of service may be quite different from mine. If I can make you aware that minimum levels of service in a rural library may not now include access to such "technological breakthroughs" as the telephone, the typewriter, the card catalog, or duplication equipment; or even access to the building for the handicapped, as is the case with the Lake County Library in Lakeport, California . . . *let alone* sophisticated networking equipment, computerized information and referral systems, and TTYs, for example . . . if I can make you aware of those distinctions, then I will have partially discharged my duties to the Californians we represent. We may not be saying, "Stop the World, We Want to Get Off!", but, we might be saying, "Slow Down World, *We Want to Catch Up!*"

3) Children are the future of the libraries. Libraries must ensure that the young are involved in the planning for all library services. There is a need for a national pro-library youth group. It must be established as mandatory that state education codes set the specific amount of time for instruction in library usage in grades K-12. Every school child must have access to a library.

4) Citizen participation is essential if libraries are to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. We must ensure citizen participation in library programs and services. Libraries need to encourage citizens to participate in library advocacy in the political process.

5) Libraries are invisible. Support for an improvement in library and information service can only come about if the public knows what is happening and what is needed. The public must be kept informed by all possible techniques of all library programs and services. This is an essential duty for all libraries.

6) Those in libraries must keep abreast of all future political, social, economic, and technological changes in our society. We must make certain that needed information is produced and that it is disseminated in such a way that all who wish to can use it.

In closing, I reaffirm the recommendations of the 300 delegates to the March, 1979, California Conference on Library and Information Services, and I thank NCLIS for the opportunity to present them to you.

Cecily Cocco

Testimony Submitted by David Cohen

Brief for Ethnicity Input Into the Conference Proceedings

My name is David Cohen, and I am coordinator, Ethiic Materials Information Exchange Task Force, Social Responsibilities Round Table (ALA) and director, Institute on Ethnicity and Librarianship III, Queens College Graduate School of Library and Information Studies, City University of New York.

Introduction: Since no task force report on library services to racial and ethnic minorities was made available to the Conference delegates, we feel the need for a statement pertinent to this issue. You should have in your possession a memorandum on ethnicity dated March 12, 1979. It states that the concept of ethnicity has replaced the myth of the "melting pot," and that, in fact, ours is a multicultural society.

Permit me to remind you that librarianship is closely related to ethnicity, in that it intends to serve all the people in the community and to find ways and means to reach all the ethnic groups in the library orbit. It is also incumbent on the White House Conference on Library and Information Services to deal with the positive aspects of ethnicity in developing a national outlook on libraries which makes service to ethnic groups a substantial part of any broad library program, and not simply a special feature added to meet pressing current demands.

The White House Conference should also consider what must be done through library agencies to combat racism and sexism. It

490

must further examine ways in which libraries can lend strong support to the ethnic minorities in our country in their efforts to overcome prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination, especially in print and non-print media.

The Challenge of Ethnicity: We have made considerable progress since Philip Roth, in his *Goodbye Columbus,* described the scene in the library where the librarian is perplexed or uncertain of what to do when a young Black boy walks in. Or consider that in 1968 the National Commission on Civil Disorders reported its findings that Black students lack motivation because the learning materials available to them had little or no relevance.

Progress is relative. Consider that on Thursdays the world renowned New York Public Library Reference and Research Building on 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue is closed all day. This also means that branch libraries in the local neighborhoods have seriously reduced hours of service. How do we reverse this disastrous situation in the urban centers of America?

The Brooklyn Public Library in Williamsburgh now has an active Spanish Information Center to serve the large Hispanic population in the area. When its expanded activity required an additional professional, there was considerable difficulty in locating a qualified person with Hispanic background. Minority training programs are being seriously reduced in the 1980 Federal budget. We need more training opportunities for minorities in librarianship.

Not too many years ago, the Elmhurst General Hospital in Queens was confronted with an extraordinary multilingual component among its patients. Twenty different languages were represented. A trained corps of volunteers was organized to deal with this unique situation. Public libraries similarly must be able to cope with a changing multilingual clientele. There is tremendous resistance in our country to bilingualism. This must be overcome. Last week, the Presidential Committee on the Teaching of Foreign Languages reminded us of our low priority for multilingual education by recommending more emphasis on the learning of foreign languages. Foreign collections in our libraries must be dusted off and strengthened to deal with the influx of new immigrants.

The *Roots* and *Holocaust* video programs have sparked great and growing ethnic consciousness, not only among Blacks and Jews, but among other major racial and ethnic minorities. The public broadcasting station in New York, Channel 13, WNET, is currently featuring a series on the "New Immigrants," including Columbians, Koreans, Italians, Israelis, Jamaicans, Greeks, etc.

During the first week in October 1979, a conference was held here in Washington on the Teaching of the Holocaust in Secondary Schools. Sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the National Council for the Social Studies, reports at the meeting indicated that tremendous activity was taking place in the schools across the country with curricula segments on the "Nazi

Holocaust." As the only librarian present, I reminded the participants that librarians too can play an important part in this activity, and that we should not be taken for granted. Are we aware in the library profession that the National Council for the Social Studies had officially adopted in 1976 a set of Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education with some recognition for the role of the school library in the march towards ethnicity?

Work of the Ethnic Materials Task Force: Our task force on ethnic materials has been functioning in ALA as part of the Social Responsibilities Round Table since 1973. We have attempted to delve into the problems of building ethnic collections and serving the minorities in the community. Much of the work involved getting the publishers to do more in their textbooks and trade books which reflect the ethnic diversity of the American people. Advances have been in the availability of quality interracial materials; much remains to be done in bringing these materials to the attention of the ethnic minorities in our communities. There is a vast number of potential users and/or non-users within the minority groups who must be brought into the library orbit—if the neighborhood library is to survive. *The great challenge to the White House Conference on Libraries is to design strategies which will reach significantly beyond the present 10-15 percent of the population that use our public libraries.* The major theme of this Conference in "meeting the personal needs" of all citizens has to be translated into what are the major ethnic groups in the local community that need and require our attention. If we can learn to deal with these potential users, libraries may be saved from the brink of disaster around budget time.

The proceedings of the task force, available on tape, should be useful in designing multi-ethnic programs. With the new census figures that will be available in 1980, we will be in a better position to know who are the prospective ethnic patrons in the community. The available tapes cover:

1974	Ethnicity and Librarianship, What Is It?
1975	Advances in Multiethnic Media Since 1965
1976	Multi-ethnic Workshop: Advances in Training and Service
1977	Ethnicity and Librarianship: The New Pluralism
1978	Tracking Community Ethnicity
1979	Getting to Know Your Ethnic Community
1980	(planned for)—in New York, Selected Outstanding Programs Servicing Ethnic Groups in the Local Community

Our resources are at your command. We await your call.

Training Institutes at Queens College: As a result of the extensive activity in ALA on materials and services to minority groups, we have been able to develop training programs for minority Fellows and institutes for school, college, and public librarians at Queens College Graduate School of Library and Information Studies. Since 1972, we have been engaged in sensitizing professionals to the needs of minority groups. At first we concentrated on the so-called disadvantaged groups, i.e., Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans. Subsequently, we added all other racial and ethnic minorities who are subjected to prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping.

As professionals, it was our considered decision that we must learn to work with the many racial and ethnic minorities for mutual reasons to make them library users by supplying them with vital information and contributing to their ethnic pride. We hope the delegates to this Conference will consider the foregoing recommendations as a part of an ongoing general strategy in reaching all citizens. *Ethnic groups are not special groups; they constitute the people in the community.*

Conclusion: In California, the Ethnic Services Task Force, under an LSCA grant, is doing great things for the libraries and ethnic minorities in that State. In New York we are trying to do the same for the tremendous multiethnic and multilingual population. Hopefully, with your help, every State in the union will follow California and New York. The California group leaves us with this important recommendation:

"The ultimate goal of every public library should be complete integration of services to the point where a separate ethnic component is not necessary. Ideally, ethnic and ethnic-oriented staff should exist at all levels in the library, from top administration to pages. Inclusion of ethnic needs in the planning of programs and services should be constant and automatic. All library staff should be interacting with the community, not just designated outreach librarians."

Guide for Developing Ethnic Library Services
California Ethnic Services Task Force, 1979, p. 2

ADDENDA:

Memorandum

To: NCLIS, Washington, D.C.

FROM: Ethnic Materials Information/Exchange Task Force

RE: Memorandum on Ethnicity for Transmission to the White House Conference on Libraries, prepared by D. Cohen, C.M. Diodati, and L. Sherrill, et al.

DATE: March 12, 1979

1. The concept of ethnicity has replaced the myth of the melting pot and is well described in this statement, developed at a conference (Spring 1975) jointly sponsored by the National Education Association and the Council on Interracial Books for Children:

"Ours is a multicultural society. Our population includes U.S. citizens of European, Asian, African, Central and South American, Caribbean, and Native American descent. All of these groups have contributed to the total cultural fabric of our society. Our laws, music, art, language, and literature reflect the values of this diversity. Our public educative process is obligated to reflect this reality. All people have the right of access to materials that express the rich multilingual, multicultural nature of our society. Our heritage of freedom of speech and freedom of inquiry demands this. The goals of a democratic society require it."

2. Librarianship is closely related to ethnicity, in that it intends to serve all the people in the community and so must find ways and means to reach all the ethnic groups in the library orbit, not only users, but also non-users. This relationship can only be maintained on a continuing, fruitful basis by means of creative collection building and innovative programs and services for the ethnic groups in the community. It is also incumbent on the White House Conference on Library and Information Services to make service to ethnic groups a substantial part of any broad library program, and not simply a special feature added to meet pressing current demands.

3. Beyond this basic obligation, the American Library Association has actively committed itself and its resources to a coordinated action program against racism and sexism. Specifically, this means an effort to overcome prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination in the library profession and in library constituencies. The White House Conference should also consider what must be done through library agencies to combat racism and sexism. It must further examine ways in which libraries can lend strong support to the ethnic minorities in our country in their efforts to overcome prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination, especially in print and non-print media. An ethnic minority is defined as: a group of people who identify themselves as members of a racial, national, language and/or religious group or combination thereof, which does not share the privileges of the dominant group in America. As a consequence of being members of a minority group, these people are frequently discriminated against, segregated from, and exploited by that dominant group.

4. In order to assist the White House Conference in its deliberations on appropriate legislation devoted exclusively to library services for ethnic groups, we propose the following resolution and model legislative design:

Proposed Resolution

Whereas, the ethnic populations in America represent an enormous potential source for library patronage; and

Whereas, there is no Federal library legislation addressed specifically and directly to the need for library services to ethnic populations; and

Whereas, libraries have much to offer by way of servicing and programming which could contribute to the recognition of these diverse groups and to the concept of ethnic pluralism; and

Whereas, these ethnic groups should be brought into the library orbit as library users, so that they may in turn come to the support of libraries around budget time; and

Whereas it is necessary to develop cooperation among community-based ethnic groups, public libraries, schools and institutions of higher learning;

Therefore be it resolved, that Congress consider and approve legislation directed to library services which meet the needs of ethnic groups in America.

* * *

The following model legislation is proposed to fill this important need of serving the ethnic groups described above. (Ethnic groups may be identified by race, language, and/or national origin.)

Proposed LSCA Title V

To provide planning and implementation grants for library services to ethnic groups

Purpose: To enable libraries of all types to develop planning proposals to study, organize, and deliver services and build collections for the ethnic populations in the community.

Provisions:

1. Planning and implementation grants may be used by libraries to conduct comprehensive surveys in the community to identify the ethnic mix therein.

2. Planning and implementation grants may be used by libraries to encourage ethnic groups in the community to cooperate in the planning, delivery, and evaluation of library programs.

3. Planning and implementation grants may be used for the special training of library personnel and community representatives in the delivery of library services. For this purpose, the special training may be provided by library schools and other bona fide library institutions.

4. Planning and implementation grants may be used by libraries, library schools, and other bona fide educational institutions, to promote and encourage diverse types of library information facilities in ethnic communities, e.g., Information and Referral Centers, Cultural and/or Educational Centers, joint school and public library programming, etc.

5. Planning and implementation grants may be used to secure and process the basic media resources required to service ethnic populations (e.g., bilingual materials, foreign-language books, films, tapes, posters, comics, records, etc.).

* * *

Be it further resolved, that this membership meeting of ALA on Monday, June 25, 1979, approves the sending of the above resolutions to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services for its earnest consideration; and further, that this action of the membership be reported to the press.

David Cohen
Ethnic Materials Information Exchange Task Force

Testimony Submitted by Lois Ann Colaianni

My name is Lois Ann Colaianni, and I am director of libraries at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California. I am also president of the Medical Library Association, which has a membership of over 5,000 health sciences libraries and librarians. Today I am speaking on behalf of this association.

The Medical Library Association shares with other library associations a concern about the future of information services in the United States. It recognizes the potential of this White House Conference to promote our common goal of providing for the information needs of our citizens. Many health sciences librarians have already contributed to the work of this Conference by actively participating in pre-Conferences in their home States. In addition to these individual contributions, the Medical Library Association has prepared a position statement concerning issues which we believe to be of extreme importance to all citizens. At this time I would like to call your attention to the Association's recommendations.

Access to Information: The Medical Library Association supports improved access to information. Our particular interest is improved access by professionals and the public to health information. We urge the inclusion of funds for information services and facilities in *all* appropriate legislation. We also encourage the expansion of existing library legislation to include health sciences libraries. The growing demands from health professionals, patients, and the public for information and education, coupled with the rise in book, journal, and audiovisual costs, have placed a tremendous financial strain on health sciences libraries. Past legislation has not always included provision for information services to support new programs in the health field, nor have resources been available to provide adequate information to the fullest benefit of all citizens.

Resource-sharing: The Medical Library Association supports the development of networks which include all types of libraries.

Health sciences libraries, because of their experience with the national medical library network, are oriented to participating in resource-sharing programs. It is not possible for any one library, whether in the health sciences or any other subject area, to meet every user need from its own resources. Health sciences library resources must be included in cooperative library efforts in order for these programs to meet fully the needs of citizens.

Outreach programs: The Medical Library Association supports outreach or extension programs that will bring health information services to those who are now isolated by socio-economic, cultural or geographic barriers. There is a critical need for current information in inner-city areas, as well as in rural regions in which 46 percent of the Nation's hospitals are located.

Continuing education: The Medical Library Association supports innovation in and expansion of educational opportunities which enable librarians to take full advantage of new technologies and information management methods. If librarians are to provide the quality of services necessary for today's citizens and their information needs, they must continually update their professional skills. The pace of new developments in the field of information services requires that educational opportunities be made widely available to librarians at all stages of their careers.

I have summarized for you the Medical Library Association's position statement, which was mailed to all Conference delegates.

Lois Ann Colaianni
Medical Library Association

Testimony Submitted by James E. Crayton

As we here at the White House Conference on Library and Information Services look at the state of these services on a nationwide basis, and propose guidelines and set priorities for development of library services for generations to come, I would like to call attention to the needs of the Black community. These needs are often shared with others, but are more concentrated in the Black portion of the population. For we are often more than one minority—we are sometimes the elderly, the person existing at poverty level, the unemployed, the semi-literate, the shut-in, the handicapped. We are too, the "regular" library user, the mid-income, the educated, the print-oriented, the taxpayer, and the community model citizen. Library service must then appeal and relate to all aspects of Black society, but focus particularly on the underserved, for we are all at the most only one or two generations from subsistence for ourselves and our families as a daily concern.

Often patterns of library service tend to be set by the patterns of housing. Inner cities are predominantly minority and also predominantly Black. Library service here has been allowed to deteriorate in terms of collections, facilities, and trained staff, as emphasis on funding is placed on suburban libraries. Branch libraries suffer reduction in hours, replacement of professionals with less well-trained staff, reduction in the amount of new materials; and frequently the branch is closed as a means of cost-savings and replaced with a mobile unit, or not at all. There must be assured, continuing funding for urban libraries, and a magnified commitment by those libraries to an equal level of service in all of their outlets.

Where libraries exist in Black communities, they may be under-utilized. Attitudes of staff, contents of collections, programs offered, and hours of operation may be at fault. Libraries, because of their governmental affiliation, are sometimes warily viewed by the Black community. Every effort should be made to include community representation in the operation of and decision making for the library. Some administrators have stated that the cost for operation of "outreach" services must be weighed against "basic" library services, without defining "basic" services. I contend that "outreach" services are basic services. As part of the involvement of citizens in libraries, they should help decide which services are to be offered through their libraries. This means that attitudes toward service by administrators and librarians must be changed. Graduate library schools should incorporate training in each area of instruction to sensitize future library leaders to the needs of Black communities. This sensitizing should not be limited to courses in outreach services, children's services, or other public services. The administrator developing the budget for the system or the State needs to be as much aware of the needs of Blacks as the librarian at the branch level. If additional funding is needed to encourage this awareness, it must be made available.

What are the needs of the Blacks? These needs should be entertained at this Conference. Furthermore, the needs should be ascertained from within the Black community. To do so, lay people of the respective communities must be involved and heard. In addition, every effort should be made to assure that the libraries are kept free, accessible, and open, and that user requirements are minimized and no fees for service charged. This is particularly necessary as computerized information systems which are expensive are developed and the cost is passed along to the user. This has the potential of forming an information elite based on the ability to pay.

The culture and contributions of Blacks in America should be recognized as a vital and positive way of life. Funds for collection building to reflect Black contributions to society should be available. In many libraries, special funds are designated for local or oral history collections. Rarely does this include a record of the Black community which exists as a part, but may have developed quite differently from, the larger community. Genealogical materials are regularly purchased. Race records are seldom identified or purchased except in the larger source collections. Special efforts should be made in collection development in public, university, and college libraries with funds available to foster research and collecting original documents.

Funds are needed for special internship or other programs which identify and financially encourage young Black persons to enter the field of librarianship, or for those already in the field to expand and upgrade their education to make them eligible for career advancement beyond the entry or secondary level of employment. Efforts should be made to provide awareness training or to foster library staff in services to all minorities.

There needs to be coordination at the local, State, and national level to assure the inclusion of libraries in grants to communities whether these projects are nutrition sites, recreation centers, urban renewal, education, or whatever. The lines in the Black community between organizations of various types and services received are not sharply drawn, because the people affected by those services, as well as the people involved in delivering the services, may be a part of the same small community, even the same family.

Youth and children are our future. Very careful and special consideration should be given to programs to encourage them to develop to their fullest. Where reading and literacy are not available in the home, it is the library which must foster this appreciation and these programs. This may involve restructuring traditional services to children and young people to meet current needs. Needs assessments surveys must be conducted to determine what and where services should be supplied, and when/how/and by whom. Blacks working together through the Black Caucus of the American Library Association, or through community groups sponsored by Federal or State programs, are one step in determining the needs of the Black community.

In summary, many of the needs of Blacks in America are the same as those of other minorities. There is an urgency, however, in the Black community to make the library relevant to the immediate and long-term needs of the people. It is politically sound for continued community support of libraries to be an important part of supplying knowledge to all citizens. The library, on the other hand, is the most likely institution to provide this knowledge. "Outreach" services and "basic" services are one and the same and should be continued and adequately supported as a national policy by this Conference.

James E. Crayton
California Librarians-Black Caucus

Testimony Submitted by James P. Dillon

My name is Jim Dillon. I am a sophomore at New York University. I am here to tell you why college students, particularly the hundreds of thousands of us who live at home and commute, are dependent upon public libraries as part of our educational resources.

Students' use of public libraries to supplement the libraries of their own academic institutions is a well-established matter of record.

When public libraries, like the schools and colleges, were reeling from the impact of the postwar baby boom in the 1960's, a number of them took a look at just who their users were. An examination of the library habits of students in 80 institutions of higher education in New York City revealed that more than eight out of 10 students used some other library in addition to the one in their respective schools, and that half of them did so at least once a month. (Monthly use of a library is generally considered to be heavy use.) Public libraries, it was found, provided the greatest part of this additional service. The authors of the study concluded that "most of New York's higher education students use, and use heavily, the wealth of library resources available to them in New York City to supplement and, no doubt in some instances, to supplant the libraries provided at their own schools." A similar study conducted in Ohio in 1968 reinforced these findings.

Another primary factor influencing the pattern of library use by college students is the quality of the library collection at his institution of learning. According to a report recently issued by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the institutional libraries of community colleges are severely understaffed, their collections are only "50 percent of the indicated needs for collections for their enrollments and programs," and access to these libraries is limited by short hours of service. Of all the academic libraries found to fall short of the "minimum need" of 60 hours of library service a week, more than half are two-year colleges. Community colleges are the fastest growing sector in higher education, with an increase in enrollment of more than fivefold since 1960, and with anticipated continued growth at least into the early 1980's. What this means, in terms of increasing dependence on public libraries by community college students, is self-evident.

The most significant rise in student use of public libraries has resulted from the phenomenal growth in the number of adults enrolling in educational programs. For the first time in our history the majority of new students enrolled in postsecondary institutions are adult students continuing their education on a part-time basis. Part-time students have far outstripped increases in full-time enrollment. By 1980, there will be twice as many part-time students as there were in 1970, accounting for 43 percent of total college and university enrollment.

In 1959, one adult in 11 was involved with adult education. By 1973, one adult in four was involved with adult education; and one in eight was heading for a degree. Among these are middle-management executives in their forties and fifties who feel the competition from more academically qualified younger men; housewives who want to reenter the job market; mid-career job changers; and adults who had dropped out of college and now simply want the satisfaction of "getting that degree."

These are highly motivated students who must live off-campus because of their familial and occupational obligations. They tend to be keen learners, seeking extra reading in their fields and research for their school papers. But quite often these goals cannot be fully achieved because of the limitations of the library. Time is a determining factor. Adult students often spend several hours getting to and from school. Even in New York City, where there is an extensive, somewhat efficient public transportation network, it can take more than an hour to travel from some parts of the Bronx and Brooklyn to Manhattan. For students who have to spend valuable time traveling, library hours are inadequate.

The National Center for Educational Statistics estimates that $81.4 billion Federal, State, and local tax dollars were spent in 1974-1975 by the Nation's elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning. In contrast, the total amount of tax dollars spent in 1974 on public libraries amounted to approximately $1 billion, the equivalent of 1.2 percent of the education budget.

Higher education alone accounts for $19.7 billion of the total tax dollars spent on education, or $2,525 per full-time equivalent student. Operating expenditures in 1974 by college and university libraries amounted to an average of $134 per student—an inadequate percentage of dollars spent on education.

When it comes to the expenditure of tax dollars, 91 percent ($17.9 billion) of the tax dollars spent by institutions of higher education comes from Federal and State government sources, while only 16.7 percent ($168 million) of the funds for public libraries comes from the same sources.

The number of academic institutions served by a single public library can be staggering. One director of a public library in a New York suburban county recently estimated that he served students from 50 different colleges during any one-week period. Two colleges are located in the same geographical area his library serves, but the library is also used by commuting students who attend such major metropolitan institutions as New York University, Columbia, Hunter, and Fordham—all in New York City—and Rutgers, Fairleigh Dickinson, and Paterson State, in New Jersey.

A 1967-1968 survey of users of the Detroit main library's reference and research facilities showed that full-time students accounted for 64 percent of total use: 42 percent were college and university students; 22 percent were noncollege, primarily high school students. These figures did not include the thousands of part-time students who also used the library. Of particular interest was the discovery that an average of 60 percent of all people who visited that library, regardless of primary occupation, whether they were accountants, lawyers, or clerical workers, came to the library for "school work." Nurses, for example, gave this reason for their visits. Of all the 27 occupational groups coded for the survey, only eight groups fell below 25 percent in naming education as the reason for using the public library. Next to full-time students, teachers ranked highest in total use.

In addition to the once typical college student home for vacation (who still uses his hometown public library during summers and holidays), there is now a fast-growing new breed of student who is a regular, year-round public library user. He or she is the commuting student. He may go to school full-time or part-time, he may work or not work, his classes may be held on or off campus. None of these factors is as important to his pattern of library uses as is the fact that he lives "off campus." Generally, he or she lives at home and the closest library is usually the public library. Even students enrolled at colleges or universities with exceptional library facilities will make substantial use of community public libraries for the sake of convenience.

The most direct result from the shortchanging of public libraries is a restriction on the hours when libraries are open. For part-time and commuting students, a closed door often means complete denial of access to library materials. Even for full-time students, the need for extended hour library operations is real. Students' need for libraries is especially heavy in the evenings, holidays, and weekends. These are the first hours eliminated when cutbacks in public-library service occur, to avoid overtime and other added cost associated with night and weekend use.

That's why I am here today to urge the passage of a new National Library Act to provide a fairer share of Federal and State funds to public libraries.

James P. Dillon

Testimony Submitted by Sandy Dolnick

Friends of Libraries USA was formed to provide access to information and ideas for library support groups. We have learned to deal with their practical day-to-day problems through our newsletter *The Friends of Libraries National Notebook*, which has provided material for over two years to more than 700 such groups across the United States.

As an educational and advocacy group in support of better library service, we will stimulate and encourage grass roots advocacy, disseminating information with help from the Washington office of the American Library Association. We will help with our members' public relations efforts to help make the public aware of their existence, and of the services they perform.

We plan on publicizing the White House Conference results and their implementation across the country. As we expand our services with regional efforts, Friends of Libraries USA will help fill the void that has existed in the establishment of citizen support.

We want to encourage the development of more Friends of Libraries groups. Friends can be anything you want. Use us, please.

Sandy Dolnick
Friends of Libraries USA

Testimony Submitted by Donald P. Ely

Topic Area: Nonprint Communication Technologies

Issue: In a world which has been traditionally oriented to providing information in print formats, many individuals are receiving information from nonprint resources. What is the role of the library in a multimedia world?

Position: Libraries which have been traditionally print-oriented need to consider expansion to nonprint media in order to meet the information requirements of today's library user.

Recommendation: There should be no preference placed on one medium over another when filling individual information needs.

Note: *This paper is presented as a personal statement. Dr. Ely is director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources at Syracuse University and is a Trustee of the Dewitt (NY) Community Library.*

Information and Education in a Multimedia World

By Donald P. Ely

Samuel Johnson is reported to have described two types of knowledge: knowing a subject ourselves, or knowing where to find information about a subject. Traditionally, education has emphasized the former—helping students to acquire knowledge. The current information explosion seems to require the other type of knowledge—providing the individual with the means to locate information.

We live in a time which has been described as the age of information. Marc Porat points out that information activity accounts for 46 percent of the gross national product (GNP) in the United States. Further, he states that "nearly half the workforce—some 41,000,000 men and women—today earn their livelihood by manipulating symbols. . . . Information technologies, the wedded twins of computers and communications, are the new catalysts of economic and social evolution. We call this . . . the Information Society."

It should be said today that one indicator of wealth in any nation is its access to information. Thus, an information-rich country has greater potential for economic growth than an information-poor nation. One key to development in any society is the availability of data and information. A concomitant requisite, however, is the ability to interpret and use the available data and information. From this perspective, information is power.

The information industry is made up of people who handle information. Oettinger (1975) outlines the dimensions of the industry by describing those who work in it and their functions:

The creators—research and development advertising, computer programmers, authors, composers, poets.

The processors—data processing services, legal services, bank and credit card services, insurance agents, security brokers.

The collectors—libraries, data retrieval services, the intelligence community.

The communicators—education, telephone, telegraph, radio, television, postal services, mobile radio, newspapers, book and periodical publishers, motion pictures, theaters, agricultural extension agents. The information equipment producers—computer and related equipment, radio and television sets, paper, photo equipment and supplies.

The focus of this paper is on the collectors and communicators, those people who gather data and information which others have produced and make it available through live and mediated channels to those who need it.

Two Indicators: There are two indicators of the ways in which the users of information services are changing:

1) the increasing use of the mass media, especially television; and

2) the increasing use of nonprint communication technologies by individuals.

When we discuss the user of information services, we are referring to the learner in formal educational settings (elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools) and in nonformal programs which are not always attached to an educational institution. We are also talking about library patrons who seek out the services of a public library. For our purposes, we will consider the individual to be the focal point of our efforts.

The Increasing Use of Mass Media, Especially Television: It comes as no news that the average television viewing time in American households is about six hours per day. There is the oft-quoted statistic that by the time youngsters finish high school they have spent more time watching TV than they have in school. Preschoolers spend more waking hours watching television than in any other activity. Thus, television has become a permanent fixture in American homes, ubiquitous in its nature and commanding of our time.

The classroom will always come out on the short end if the performance there is compared with the products on the tube. But perhaps we should not enter into such comparisons. Edgar Dale says,

> ". . . entertainment and education are worlds apart. . . . The only test of entertainment is immediate pleasure . . . education is memorable, entertainment is written in the sand. The test of entertainment is . . . not in its capacity to furnish our minds with memorable thoughts and deeds but just the opposite."

We are long on entertainment and short on education. We need entertainment just as we need sleep, but we have far, far too much of it. Entertainment can crowd out the informative, educational aspects of the mass media. Instead of the sauce which adds to the savor, it becomes a whole meal.

The Increasing Use of Nonprint Communication Technologies: Some schools and libraries have adopted the use of nonprint media as legitimate extensions of their charge to serve students and patrons. Teachers and librarians often view audiovisual media as competitors of traditional teaching and learning resources and, in many cases, are completely unfamiliar with even the simplest level of technical knowledge which would permit them to use media themselves or to help learners understand and use these contemporary communication formats.

Technological Developments Do Not Wait For Education: While educators and librarians are pondering what to do with the media that are already here and are so pervasive, more and more technological developments appear as our society is becoming increasingly devoted to the production and distribution of information. The new thrust is derived from breakthroughs in computers, large-scale integrated circuits (the silicon "chips"), teleprocessing, the laser, fiber optics, mobile transceivers, satellites, and sophisticated home and office terminals. These are the elements of the emerging information and communication infrastructure. But these technologies are largely unfamiliar, esoteric, and somewhat bewildering to educators and librarians.

Consider a few examples of the new developments. The MCA-Phillips optical disc system already in industrial distribution, is an LP-sized record which provides a half hour of full video color and stereo sound. It costs 60 cents per disc at the factory. Because the data is recorded and read by the laser, nothing actually touches the plastic-coated disc, so it virtually never wears out. It can provide freeze frame, slow motion, reverse motion, and automatic search for any one of 54,000 frames per record. For the home market, MCA is planning to sell primarily MCA-owned movies, which will be very inexpensive. They claim that the five-disc set of "Jaws" will sell for $10.

The computer, too, is becoming highly individualized. In the past 15 years, the logic capability per-square-inch of the computer has increased seven-fold; another seven-fold increase is expected in the next five years. Tiny chips, which are themselves computers, already have replaced mechanical logic systems in our home appliances, in televisions and microwave ovens. To this will be added the bubble memory, which is the first nonmechanical memory technique which will do to memory banks what the transistor did to logic units. Users will be able to plug a tiny bubble electronic storage unit into their pocket calculators for data storage and retrieval, which means the average school person will have the computer capability in his/her hand that 20 years before required hundreds of thousands of dollars and a roomful of electronic equipment.

These new technological developments are quietly changing the way we work, make decisions, learn, and spend our leisure time. The new products and processes are opening new opportunities and benefits, but at the same time new risks are present and policy issues of utmost gravity must be faced and resolved.

By definition we live and work in a technological society. Our schools and libraries are institutions of that society, and therefore must keep pace with it or gradually move out of the mainstream into the periphery and suffer additional losses of personnel and resources.

The Road Ahead: Professionals who are involved in the world of information resources need to coordinate efforts. Combined strength (not competitive struggle) should accelerate and promote the growth of the field. The world is not made up of print and nonprint sectors. It is a world in which people seek information which is responsive to their needs. Regardless of an individual's professional orientation and training, we must recognize the values and limitations of all media formats. We must realize that people use information which is needed, accessible, and easy to use. We must be part of the growing movement to use the resources which technology has given us to deliver information to people who need it, where they need it, and in the form which best matches their communication styles. To do less is to negate the advances we have made as a people.

References

Edgar Dale. "Education or Entertainment," Can You Give the Public What It Wants? *New York: Cowles Education Corp., 1967, pp. 35-39.*

Anthony Oettinger and Peter Shapiro. "Information Industries in the United States," Britannica Book of the Year, *1975, p. 18.*

Marc Porat. The Information Economy. *Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1976.*

Donald P. Ely

Testimony Submitted by Helen Faust

Our society cares about children. In this, the International Year of the Child, in thousands of special programs throughout the Nation, we have demonstrated our commitment to the rights of children—their right to adequate food, clothing and shelter; their right to protection of their health and welfare; their right to respect for their emerging individuality; their right to the love and care of parents or substitute parents; and their right to an appropriate education. We invest huge sums in programs for children because of our fundamental belief that every child should have the opportunity to develop to his or her full potential.

I am proud to be a citizen of a nation which places such a high priority on the healthy development of children and does not begrudge one cent of the tax dollars or voluntary contributions used in their behalf. In fact, my interest in testifying here today reflects my belief that we need to invest more funds in libraries if we are to make them the lifelong learning resource they have the potential to be. While lifelong learning opportunities are needed by all ages of people, my special interest is in the need of children and youth for a library system which provides both school-related and community-based libraries.

We have in this country a marvelous network of schools, technical institutes, colleges, and universities. Modern, well-equipped libraries are an essential component of all of these institutions. The expansion of our knowledge and of the literature in every field—literature which includes books, magazines, films, tapes, slides, records, and all sorts of documents—means that no single teacher nor any single text can present a complete and accurate picture on any subject. Schools, if they are to approach the ideal of making truth accessible to youth, must have the additional resource of adequately funded libraries.

How libraries assure the level of bibliographical support for all of the curricular areas offered by particular institutions is another issue, and one which I am happy to leave to the library professionals, with the expectation that they are continuously addressing this concern. It is, however, obvious that if school libraries are to provide the kind of support needed, they will require increased funding as well as some system of interlibrary cooperation. Another concern is the need of children and youth for the community-based library as a resource of independent self-motivated and self-directed learning.

Schools at all levels, with the possible exception of kindergarten and the higher graduate levels, are committed to objectives defined by society. We expect from our formal educational system the teaching of basic skills, preparation at each level for the demands of the next higher level—in the middle school for the high school, in high school for employment or for higher education, and so on. We add the expectation of preparation for citizenship, for family life, and for enjoyment of the arts. In short, formal education is expected to prepare for the tasks of living in our highly complex world. This is not to deny that many good teachers and schools will employ methods which foster self-directed learning and the love of learning for its own sake. But the reality is that the complexity and the pressures of demands upon formal educational institutions frequently limit their options.

Children need to have the freedom offered by libraries and museums where they are available (where they are not available, libraries should supply some of the same experiences)—the freedom to browse and to have experiences which stimulate their curiosity; to examine without a set purpose, books, periodicals, pictures which may spark an intellectual interest and foster independent study.

Children also need to have resources for pursuing their natural curiosity. If they are lucky, that curiosity may be satisfied in the classroom, but often that curiosity relates to some subject not related to their current curriculum. A child captivated by the song of a bird or by the sight of a butterfly fluttering in the garden may well be stimulated to begin a study of natural science. A child living close to an airport hearing regularly the sounds of planes overhead may begin to wonder how flight in huge machines is possible. The nurturing of such interests can affect the whole of life, either through impact on career choice or through the joy of such knowledge for its own sake.

The list of possible experiences, taken for granted by adults but highly stimulating to the intellectual curiosity of a child, is endless. Sometimes the significant adults in a child's life can satisfy such curiosity—more often they cannot. Children and youth need to have a resource for responding to their curiosity whatever its direction, a resource which assists and encourages their independent exploration and allows them to have the great joy of independent intellectual achievement. Never has our nation more sorely needed to foster such intellectual development. Adequate support for libraries which recognize the needs of children and have the facilities for responding is clearly one way of meeting this need.

Helen F. Faust
Girls' Coalition
Philadelphia

Testimony Submitted by Sandra Nealy Ferguson

My name is Sandy Ferguson. I am 15 years old and a sophomore at Walt Whitman High School. I have used the public library as long as I can remember, as a small child and as a school student. I am here to testify from my own personal experience that public libraries are an essential part of America's public school system.

Reading is the most important skill a child can learn—not simply making out words, but understanding concepts and unleashing their own imagination and ideas. Studies have shown that adults who are "readers" are more likely to be successful than adults who are not. The usual measurements of success—higher education, higher income, career satisfaction—all correlate with adult reading. Children who read for pleasure are much more likely to become readers when they grow up than those who are never introduced to books. A study at the Enoch Pratt Library in Baltimore showed that as many as three-fourths of the youngest library users develop a lifelong reading habit.

Libraries today are directing their efforts to reach preschool (three-to-five-year-old) children. Because play is the chief learning activity of this age group, librarians are now supplementing their storytelling techniques with educational toys, games, and puzzles, along with books and other media. Working with very young children, the librarians find that the children have learned to feel completely at home in the library even before they are able to read. The earlier the start the better.

A few years ago, the Queens Borough Public Library in New York developed a mobile Library-Go-Round unit to provide a kind of stepping stone for kids left out of community preschool programs. Gaily decorated vans traveled the streets of the most economically depressed neighborhoods. At each stop a half-hour story presentation with songs, games, and fingerplays was given. The vans did not simply stop at a likely corner and wait for children to materialize; kids were actively sought out. The local poverty agencies helped pick locations, and their staff members went into the streets to gather children. Door-to-door canvassing was done. Special flyers printed in English, Spanish, and Italian told what the Library-Go-Round was, and when and where it was scheduled to appear. Library staff scoured laundromats, check-cashing stores, and other neighborhood shops where parents might be with their children. Unfortunately, today there is no more Library-Go-Round for the children in Queens. Federal funds, which had almost entirely supported the program, were cut off and no local or state dollars could be found to keep the mobile units on the streets.

In cities and rural areas across the land the need for making greater use of public library children's services in a new and creative way is more and more apparent. The public library makes a unique contribution in helping to create a desirable environment for the child. Unique because the child enters voluntarily to seek out books and records and games that amuse him (or her), challenge him, help him to understand himself and the world of which he is a part. Here he is recognized as an individual worthy of respect. No matter what his background, his progress (or lack of progress) in school, his interests or hobbies, the child's preferences and desires are responded to. The public library offers an atmosphere that encourages the mind to explore and to stretch out.

Why does a high school student use the public library? For one thing, the public library is usually open after the school library closes. The public library is also available on weekends. Mitchell Baron, a student at South Shore High School in Brooklyn, New York, puts it another way: "The school library doesn't have the stuff we need." (Many school libraries are primarily curriculum-oriented and lack sufficient breadth to fulfill all the student's requirements.)

Then there are research projects like the one given to a member of an economics class in Mobile, Alabama, whose assignment was to compare today's prices for consumer goods with those of the 1930's and 1940's. He went to his public library and examined microfilm copies of *The New York Times* to compare clothing advertisements then and now. Members of the Needham, Massachusetts, high school class were assigned the task of writing a paper on the life of a well-known local historical figure. Their main source turned out to be the local newspaper archives in the public library.

Maybe the student is one of a group of teenagers who gather at one of the big library tables to do homework with friends, especially if conditions are crowded at home. Of course, there are also the long-time users, like myself, who started out in the children's reading room during preschool years and have kept up the habit of coming back for books, advice, and guidance ever since.

One or more of these reasons usually fits the millions of high school students who use America's public libraries every year. That is why I am here today to urge the passage of a new National Library Act to provide a fairer share of Federal and State funds to public libraries.

Sandra Nealy Ferguson

Testimony Submitted by Graeme Foster

Since 1960, I have visited this country on seven different occasions and spent more than three years working in a range of educational settings in different locations but always related to information services. I believe this has given me an opportunity to become sensitive to some international opportunities, barriers, similarities, or constraints between Australia and the United States that at least ought to be recognized or removed.

This Conference may be the outstanding opportunity of the century to start new procedures in this area. I was encouraged in my endeavors when I read Charles Benton's statement "that we cannot discuss library and information services as if they stopped at our national borders." Tasmania—devils and all—is certainly remote from your national borders, but vitally interested in the matters under discussion at the Conference. I want to briefly refer to four important issues as I see them, from an Australian, and also an international, viewpoint.

Partnership rather than Patronship: Clearly identifiable in Australia at this moment is a range of activities in line with the five major themes of this White House Conference. Your priorities in this regard would slot precisely into a list of similar priorities in Australia. As such, Australia sees itself very much as the hub or the core of a range of programs. A major area is the one of increasing international understanding and cooperation. Some index of the current commitment is revealed when one realizes that almost $500 million will be spent this year on overseas aid programs—a 12 percent increase over last year. The recipients are all in the immediate geographical area—Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Thailand, Malaysia, Fiji, and Western Samoa—and the target is, as I stated clearly, to increase international understanding and cooperation. Many programs are in the area of libraries and information services.

My point is that there does exist here a potential for the United States to plug into these regional developments, and I would argue that cooperative developments in a collegiate style matched with Australian programs is likely to achieve more in the South

Pacific region than unilateral actions. I am confident that such a partnership would combine the advantages of local regional knowledge, the expert view of the outsider, and the capacity to build on or modify established programs.

The Difficulty of Reading the Play: It is always difficult to translate overseas experiences. The temptation to do this is enhanced with a common language and in this regard Australia is no exception. In Australia, the constitutional authority for education is primarily vested in the States. There are now seven State authorities and a special authority for the national capitol. No other authority looms larger on the Australian scene than the State systems. There are no counterparts to the local education authority common in this country, nor do the national education bodies match the functions of those in the United States. There are no difficulties in identifying within Australia some impressively labeled national organizations which on the surface would appear to be near the "flash point" of information and action.

My cautionary advice is to be sensitive to the strong and well established State structure and the administrative vehicles which coordinate them.

The power and influence of these State authorities is coordinated in the Australian Education Council. It includes each of the States' Director-Generals of Education and has a permanent Secretariat. Other examples in the area of information services could be chosen to illustrate different organizational patterns, national systems of broadcasting educational radio and television programs, for example. Contrary to the view that is represented so often, Australia is a more highly urbanized nation than the United States. Its student population is highly concentrated in large cities. The remote two-way radio teaching systems affect a small number of students in outback Australia, yet international literature rarely fails to make it a headline. Colleen McCulloch's *Thorn Birds* contributes to this exaggeration of the exceptional.

My point is that Australia has a concentrated State pattern of education. It has an identifiable organization which should be preferred to the Federal bodies who are more visible.

"Down Under" Developments: It is to our detriment that many pioneering thoughts and performances in the area of libraries and information services do not find a ready sounding board in this country. The problem of course is the lack of the appropriate machinery, not the lack of interest by professional educators in either country.

As an example, may I refer to a major report on copyright law and reprographic reproduction which is currently being studied by the Australian Parliament. Many aspects of the report would have benefitted by closer scrutiny from an international viewpoint. Some of the concepts are worthy of such attention. May I illustrate with one example which emerges from the State Education Departments? It contends that "once a copyright work has been broadcast by some form of electro-magnetic radiation, with no controlled channelling for the precise reception by a specific number of receivers, then the broadcast should be considered in the public domain. Other forms of distribution of a message, whether or not they are verbalised, have a designated output and a designated address to which output is delivered. The receiver, in accepting, has the option not to accept. The receiver, therefore, has the requirement to pay for it or not as the output authority requires."

The recommendation then, in summary, was that it be acknowledged that radio and television broadcasts, without controlled channelling for the precise reception by a specific number of receivers, may be freely recorded and that appropriate copyright clearance be made at the broadcast source.

Ultimately, of course, there will be solutions to such problems. It is not an Australian problem; it is not an American problem; it is an international problem. And for that reason the combined power, wisdom and influence of information specialists and educators needs to be gathered together to provide unilateral support, alternative ideas, and enlightened strategies, all of which must be available at the critical moment of need.

Ways must be found to publicize the activities of national organizations concerned with library and information services, so that we can participate more fully in international developments. The output from the United States in this regard is reasonable but it is primarily a one-way flow. It is difficult to find information about Australian activities in this country. In consequence, one finds that an incredulous air descends upon an American audience when they learn for example that every Tasmanian high school is equipped with two video cassette recording systems and has been for several years. And that these same high schools each have terminals connected to an educational media computer data bank, which sponsors the delivery of 3,000 to 4,000 resources per week to the region's schools!

The facts about such emerging systems ought to be known. Their failures and their successes ought to be shared. Mutual identification of such activities should take place at the highest professional level.

More of the Same: It may come as a surprise to many information specialists to learn that in the view of many educationists, the amount of information in the school's immediate environment could be greatly reduced without any significant impact on what students learn or what teachers teach. This contention is a contradiction to the oft expressed view of the teachers "for more information resources" or for that matter to the avowed policy of most schools that they need "more funds for more resources."

Our research-based inquiries of schools' information resources reveals a completely different picture. Schools have more information immediately available than they can use. There is a surplus of information resources—not a shortage. More than 60 percent of the information services (including resources and equipment) in the schools sampled in our research were not used in a one-year period! Further surveys of the schools' resource acquisition, their information management and implementation routines reveals a consistently pathetic picture. The match between the information available and the information used is poor. The continuing acquisition of resources unrelated to the curriculum needs is on-going and school libraries, for example, are growing monuments to information services both irrelevant and inconsistent with the true school curriculum.

The essence of this problem is being ignored in many areas. The widespread teaching of techniques of resource or information utilization is ineffective and is little more than a smoke-screen. There must be a renewed concern for the dilemma of the information user in primary and secondary schools and this should manifest itself in a different approach from the currently popular one of: 1) one filmstrip for every so many students; or 2) one tape recorder for every so many students.

So often the assumptions which teachers make about the nature and processes of learning and their own instructional procedures are in conflict with the plethora of information and resources accumulating at great expense in their school. There is a need to look at these assumptions made by teachers and schools as a basis for improved information services.

Concerns have been expressed elsewhere in the Conference's summary on library networks that there is a need for shared networks to serve this country's 74,000 elementary and secondary school libraries. I would recommend that developments in this area be based on a critical and detailed analysis of the information sources and services which are *used* by the school libraries and not the information sources and services *available* to the school libraries.

Graeme Foster
Education Department of
Tasmania
Australia

Testimony Submitted by Robert Fox

The survival of contemporary fiction and poetry in this country is in jeopardy. There is no dearth of fiction writers and poets. On the contrary, there are more good writers publishing than ever, but a number of myths and misconceptions keep their works from reaching their full audience.

Since 1958, over 300 mergers and takeovers have occurred in the book industry. The effect on serious creative writing has been disastrous, for such companies, many of which are multinational conglomerates with no allegiance to any particular nation or its needs and ideals, own vast timberlands, distribution networks, and the major review media, as well as the publishing companies. The resulting supermarket mentality in book publishing, and the quest for the big book and billion dollar movie, has virtually erased serious fiction and poetry from publishers' lists. While the number of books published in this country has tripled since 1952, the number of serious works of fiction and poetry issued commercially has remained the same.

I speak primarily, but not exclusively, on behalf of the small independent press, which despite its recent upsurge in the past 16 years is still mistakenly considered to be either vanity, subversive, or a farm system for big publishing. My concern goes beyond the small presses to those writers who have signed contracts with commercial publishers only to have their books pulped before being issued, or had novels come out without a word from the publisher because another author's book had been targeted for Hollywood, or were unable to talk to their editors after their book was dropped as a possible film.

The industry would have you believe that there is little interest in fiction and poetry, and truthfully, volumes of creative writing could not be expected to sell as well as the annual diet book on the best seller list. Serious writing is not a mass market item, but to be sure, to deny or downplay the existing market is like trying to prove that a rushed meal in a noisy fastfood restaurant has replaced the leisurely homecooked supper.

I propose therefore, that if American literature is to survive, librarians who indeed bear the grave responsibility of being the guardians of our literature MUST:

1) make the acquisition of new fiction and poetry a priority in acquisition budgets and cease discriminating against small presses;

2) keep in mind that such media as *The New York Times Book Review* and *Publishers' Weekly* are little more than marketing tools of the book industry. (Librarians can learn the best of what is being published by the independent press, the university presses, and the industry by subscribing to: *The American Book Review, The New Boston Review, The International Directory of Little Magazines and Small Presses, The Small Press Review,* and *Newsart,* among others listed in the text of the following paper.)

3) open library doors to local fiction writers, poets, non-fiction writers, and playwrights by sponsoring readings and workshops which can be co-sponsored by state arts agencies and the literature program of the National Endowment for the Arts, a Federal agency in Washington, D.C.

ADDENDUM:

The Role of the Librarian
in the Survival of Contemporary Literature

Contemporary creative writing in this country is in a time of exciting renewal which the general reading public does not share. An inadvertent censorship exists, which is slowly breaking down. But two persistent myths about writing and publishing must be dissolved if the present rebirth is to have a pervasive effect on society, enabling our literature to survive and grow. The first myth maintains that commercial publishing houses exercise superior taste and judgment, making available to the public the best of what is being written; the second suggests that the small, independent press (the site of our literary renaissance) is either a vanity network, subversive conspiracy or a minor league farm system for the big leagues of commercial publishing.

Commercial publishers have never played the major role in the discovery of new talent. As far as discovery, self or small press publication tends to be the rule and not the exception. A partial list of writers who published their own major work or were published by friends includes: Pope, Blake, Burns, Irving, Whitman, Twain, and Upton Sinclair.

Len Fulton, publisher of Dustbooks, has estimated that since 1912, commercial publishers have discovered and sponsored only about 20 percent of the writers in this country—small presses and magazines have sponsored the rest. Schools such as Dada, surrealism, beat poetry, and concrete poetry were all first published in the small presses.[1]

The general reader might argue that the industry has sponsored serious writing even recently, with the works of such writers as E.L. Doctorow and John Gardner. To understand the role of commercial publishing, one must go back historically. It was not until the mid-19th century that publishers as such emerged by name, and not until late in that century when unscrupulous characters tended to drop from the field and it became a gentleman's profession. A privileged relationship came to exist between authors and publishers who placed quality before profits. Today, only a handful of commercial publishers remain who have lasting commitments to their authors.

While some of the big names in the industry could once be persuaded to publish the work of writers like Hemingway and Faulkner (whose first works appeared in limited, privately printed editions), a great change began to occur in the late 1950's and early 1960's, making it virtually impossible for an unknown writer to have his work printed. According to the Authors Guild, over 300 mergers have taken place in the past 20 years.[2] The mergers have been motivated by the American obsession with growth and expansion which has dominated industry since the end of the Second World War. According to *Publishers Weekly* statistics, the number of books published in the United States has grown from 13,000 in 1950 to over 40,000 in 1974[3]—a figure that remains constant today.

Government tax policies have contributed to this expansion by encouraging owners of small companies to convert their holdings into shares of stock in large ones. It is interesting to note that the number of small presses has grown as the number of mergers and takeovers has increased. Just in the recent past, the number of small presses listed with the *International Directory of Little Magazines and Small Presses* has grown from 997 in 1974 to 1,950 in 1978.[4]

In response to the increasing difficulty writers had in getting published, many writers decided, "To hell with Godot, we'll do it ourselves."[5] It is interesting to note that the rise of independent publishing in the 1960's corresponds not only with the return to traditional crafts, such as leather, ceramics, and furniture making; the increased interest in natural foods cannot be unrelated to the mergers and takeovers occurring in the food industry.

A thorough listing of who owns what in the book industry can be found in the *PW* article on "concentration." Many of the parent companies, such as MCA and Gulf-Western, are Hollywood studios, or corporations that own vast timberlands from which pulp for book paper is produced. The influence of conglomerate corporations on their subsidiaries cannot be understated. CBS and *The New York Times* are two parent companies presently in court over anti-trust law violations. While the legal aspects of conglomerate control of the book industry is an interesting and revealing area for study—parallels could probably be found with oil companies and their utility subsidiaries—my concern here is to describe some of the most important changes conglomerate ownership has brought to the book industry. These changes can be itemized as follows: the lost identity of book publishers, mass marketing techniques, demoralizing effects on editorial staffs, the peculiar economics of book publishing, and the devastating effects upon writers.

Several years ago, Robert Giroux of Farrar, Strauss and Giroux summarized the commercial book world as follows: "Book publishing is hardly related to literature."[6] Indeed, Doubleday now calls itself a communications company, as if to dissociate itself from books, and many other parent companies are multinational corporations which can no longer be thought of as making an identifiable product!

The corporate takeover of book publishing has had its most visible effect in the vast changes in marketing techniques. The typical trade book will not remain on the shelf for longer than the original order, which is usually two weeks for 10 books. In the words of one editor: "Books are produced like steers to be slaughtered monthly."[7]

The practice of producing and marketing books like beef cattle or soap, has changed the personnel who staff the editorial offices. The editor with a sympathy for new currents in writing, with an eye towards innovation, has, for the most part, fled the industry. Literary people have been replaced by management personnel, and the mediocrity in editing that has resulted is laughable. A successful book brings numerous imitations. Many agents, as well as authors, specialize in producing books that are copies of genre bestsellers.

A recent experiment conducted by Chuck Ross raises questions that resonate far beyond the issue of mediocrity. Ross submitted, in typewritten manuscript, copies of Jerzy Kosinski's prize winning novel *Steps* (which is still in print) to numerous conglomerate publishers, including the publisher of *Steps* and the publisher of Kosinski's earlier books. Ross used the pseudonym Demos. An editor at Houghton Mifflin, publisher of the earlier novels said, "Jerzy Kosinski comes to mind as a point of comparison, but the manuscript as it stands doesn't add up to a satisfactory whole."[8]

How could two publishers not recognize their own author, a National Book Award winner? Even if they couldn't recognize the work, why couldn't they recognize its quality? Yet, the myth persists that big publishing houses exercise superior taste and literary judgment.

Those few remaining editors who have tried to retain the trust of their authors have been finding their confidence undermined by the huge, unwieldy bureaucracies that have consumed their companies. Impending mergers also demoralize editorial staffs, which are the last to know.

From the point of view of the businessperson, publishing is not very profitable. It is so unprofitable in fact that one wonders why conglomerates have been so eager to enter the field. Publishers have generally acknowledged that it takes the sale of 10,000 copies of a trade book to break even. Seven out of every 10 trade books lose money. The loss of Federal Title II funds from the Library Services and Construction Act, in the early 1970's, coming at a time of economic recession, made the economic pinch apparent. Publishers agreed to eliminate "marginal" books, those that sell less than 5,000 copies. Many university presses proceeded to abandon their poetry series. Many commercial publishers openly declared they could handle no new authors, and have hardly affirmed their commitments to their established ones. Poetry was the first but not the only genre to suffer. First fiction and "serious" fiction,[9] the publication of short novels and books of short stories was virtually eliminated from publishers lists. After 140 years of publishing, Bobbs-Merrill scratched fiction from its list after being purchased by ITT. (The Bobbs-Merrill logo can now be found on Raggedy Ann mobiles for infants.) A survey conducted by the literature program of the National Endowment for the Arts (reported in and available from CODA) covering the period 1952-1977 found that the number of titles of new fiction did not rise, while the number of trade books published in this country more than tripled![10]

In 1976, profit margins on trade books fell below two percent, reaffirming publishers' dependence upon the sales of subsidiary rights—primarily paperback and film. The effects of the search for higher profits has been disastrous for writers, and for all of literature. Publishers used to take pride in keeping a title in print. Some books sold well, but slowly, over a long period of time, and some found their readership years after being introduced. These books were called "sleepers," a bygone phenomenon in the world of commercial publishing. When books are removed from their shelves after the original order has not sold out, they are remaindered—sold at a fraction of list price to dealers, or pulped. Some books are pulped before being bound, when enough advance orders are not received. Pulping an unbound book provides a convenient tax write-off for a publisher.

Low profit margins encourage publishers to seek the big book, the potential multi-million dollar movie. Editors are under tremendous pressure to focus on such properties. The big book gets showered with attention—many of the other manuscripts don't get published. To a large extent, the success of a book is determined by the sale of film rights. There have been complaints, denied by the industry, of the parent company keeping the title "inhouse." The parent may be a film company, outbidding others for its hardcover subsidiary's film rights, and also seeing that its paperback susidiary also outbids its competitors. Such wheelings and dealings can be disastrous for authors. One writer complained that he could not reach his editor by phone once the parent film company lost interest in his book.

Books which are not targeted for films don't receive prime exposure in the review media. Books which are supported by major advertising are the ones that are reviewed. In a sense, the big companies buy the reviews.

Writers are under pressure to do what the publishing establishment feels it needs if they are to be commercially published. Upton Sinclair tried that over 60 years ago, and it didn't even work then.

Among some of the recent practices of publishers to increase profits are choosing subjects first and finding suitable authors afterward. John Jakes was selected by Fawcett to be the author of the Centennial Series; and it's no secret that the subject of *Jaws* was chosen by computer, the author selected later. Another recent phenomenon is the novelization of movies and TV shows. *Mork and Mindy* is the latest addition to the paperback racks.

In addition to novelizations, the newest paperback phenomenon in this country is the photonovel, copied from Latin-American countries with low literacy levels. Photonovels are collections of stills from popular movies like "Grease," with a line or two of dialogue superimposed. The decline of literacy in this country is, at least in this respect, directly encouraged by the practices of big publishing.

I had spoken earlier of an inadvertent censorship that has been keeping news of our literary revival from the general reader. Small press books are rarely reviewed in the major media because small presses cannot afford advertising space, and because well-crafted, literary books are not media events. The books (fiction) that are the subject of reviews are those targeted for TV or Hollywood, novelizations, or photonovels.

The advertising dollars for these books dictate the reviews. *The New York Times* (which is presently being sued for providing free ad space to its own subsidiaries) is as much a tool for industry profits as *Publishers Weekly*. *PW* has never carried small press reviews because it is solely a marketing tool and has nothing to do with literature. (Even when *PW* took the issue of concentration seriously enough to do a symposium on it, the word literature was not mentioned once. A few words were said about the publishing of first fiction and nothing at all about poetry.) The industry would have the reader believe that there is little interest in fiction and poetry; and truthfully, volumes of creative writing could not be expected to sell as well as the annual diet book on the best seller list. Serious writing can never be a mass market item, to be sure, but to deny or downplay the existing market by declaring that the novel or the short story is dead as an artform, as the "literary" media often did in the 1960's, is like trying to prove that a rushed meal in a noisy fastfood restaurant has replaced the leisurely homecooked supper. So, while we are in an age of excitement about language, a veritable rebirth of the written and spoken word, we are in a literary "dark ages," where the general reading public does not share the excitement.

Despite publication and distribution assistance to small presses from the literature program of the National Endowment for the Arts in Washington and State arts agencies, and despite the recent efforts of several university presses in publishing serious fiction, the financial resources available to independent presses cannot keep up with writers' backlogs. It takes up to 10 years for a writer to get a book into print. A classic case is Jerry Bumpus's *Anaconda,*[11] definitely the sort of first novel that would have been published commercially in the early 1950's, unfortunately written after the big mergers began to make themselves felt in the early 1960's—the novel, finally published in 1967, is now out of print.

When a writer does not get a book out to its audience within a reasonable amount of time after it is written, he or she is hurt, changed as a writer. But in the context of all of literature, and of the spiritual and intellectual life of the Nation, the effects are potentially disastrous. To paraphrase author Jonathon Baumbach, it is a real problem for the life of the country when the imagination, the inner life, is suppressed.[12] The question of the survival of our literature is ultimately tied to our spiritual survival. It is the responsibility of librarians, who are indeed "the guardians of our literature," to reeducate themselves and the general reading public if our literature, and indeed, our spirit, is to survive. Librarians therefore *must:*

1) make the acquisition of new fiction and poetry a priority in acquisition budgets and cease discriminating against small presses;

2) subscribe to the materials mentioned in the bibliography and cited in the footnotes of this paper;

3) open library doors to local fiction writers, poets, non-fiction writers, and playwrights by sponsoring readings and workshops in order to help develop an audience for serious writing. Such

workshops can be co-sponsored by local and State arts agencies and the National Endowment for the Arts, a Federal agency in Washington, D.C.

Footnotes

1 *Len Fulton,* Tribal Energy, *a flyer advertising the* Whole Cosmep Catalog, *(Dustbooks, Paradise, CA: 1973).*

2 CODA, *Poets & Writers Newsletter, Vol. 6, No. 3, Feb/March 1979, New York City, p. 23.*

3 *Remarks by Peter Davison,* The Publication of Poetry and Fiction, A Conference, *(Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.: 1977), p. 6.*

4 *"The Question of Size in the Book Industry Today," A special report reprinted from* Publishers Weekly, *July 31, 1978.*

5 *Len Fulton,* op. cit.

6 *Harry Smith, "Publishing and the Destruction of Values,"* The Smith, *No. 22-23, New York City: 1973, p. 5.*

7 Ibid., *p. 19.*

8 *Chuck Ross, "Rejected,"* New West, *February 12, 1979, (Beverly Hills, CA), p. 40.*

9 *Clarence Major, "The Crunch on Serious Fiction, Part I, Commercial Publishing,"* The American Book Review, *Vol. 2, No. 1, Summer, 1979, (Rutgers, N.J.), pp. 14-15. Major provides some long needed definitions.*

10 CODA, op.cit.

11 *Jerry Bumpus,* Anaconda, *(December Press, Chicago: 1967).*

12 *Jonathon Baumbach,* The Publication of Fiction and Poetry, op.cit., *p. 12.*

Annotated Bibliography

1. *International Directory of Literary Magazines and Small Presses,* Dustbooks, P.O. Box 100, Paradise, CA 95969. The most comprehensive reference book of its kind, now in its 14th year. Timid librarians have not stocked this unique reference tool because some of the 2,000 presses listed are politically radical.

2. *The Small Press Review,* edited by Ellen Ferber, same publisher, short reviews, articles of interest, Small Press Book Club a regular feature. Source of many of the leads for this article.

3. *The Publish It Yourself Handbook,* edited by Bill Henderson. The Pushcart Press, Yonkers, N.Y. 1973. Source of historical background in this article. A history rather than a manual. Pushcart is also the publisher of the annual *Best From the Small Presses,* an excellent introduction to the breadth and scope of the contemporary scene.

4. *Literary Politics in America,* Richard Kostelanetz, Sheed, Andrews, & McMeel, NYC, 1978. Paperback reprint of the famed *The End of Intelligent Writing,* a careful study of the incestuous New York publishing and reviewing scene.

5. *The Passionate Perils of Publishing,* Celeste West and Valerie Wheat, a special issue of Booklegger Magazine, 555 29th Street, San Francisco, CA, 94132, 1979. Special articles on the literary industrial complex, guides for publishers and authors, the feminist press, etc.

6. *Small Press Novels & Novellas,* subtitled: The Only Magazine Devoted Exclusively to Longer Fiction, Molly Yes Press, RD 3, Box 70B, New Berlin, NY 13411. A unique sampling of longer fiction from the small presses.

7. Review media:

a) *The American Book Review,* P.O. Box 188, New York, NY 10003. Interested in the best books being published. Covers small press, university press, commercial press. Intelligent, well-written reviews.

b) *The New Boston Review,* 77 Sacramento St., Somerville, MA 02143. Excellent national review.

c) *Stony Hills,* Box 715, Newburyport, MA 01950. Good coverage of national small press scene, with New England focus.

Robert R. Fox
Publisher
Carpenter Press

Testimony Submitted by Robert W. Frase

Protocol to the Florence Agreement

Although I am an official delegate at this Conference, I am not today representing any organization in this presentation, although many national organizations represented at this Conference have supported prompt United States adherence to the 1976 Protocol to the Florence Agreement. I am appearing as an individual because of long involvement with the original Florence Agreement from 1954 to 1966, and the development of the Protocol to the Agreement in 1975 and 1976. Among other things, I was the rapporteur of the international conference of experts in Paris in March, 1976, which formulated and recommended the text which was approved by the UNESCO General Conference in November, 1976.

The Original Agreement: The Florence Agreement (Agreement on the Importation of Education, Scientific and Cultural Materials) provides for the interchange of ideas and knowledge through the free flow of books, publications, and educational, scientific, and cultural materials. The Agreement was proposed by UNESCO in 1948 "to overcome the increasingly formidable economic obstacles to the flow of ideas" considered vital to intellectual progress and international understanding and, consequently, world peace.

The Agreement, presently contracted to by 69 nations, was opened for signature in 1950 and came into force in 1952. Signed by the Department of State in 1959, the Agreement did not enter into force for the United States until submission of its instrument of ratification on November 2, 1966, following passage of the requisite implementing legislation the previous month (Public Law 89-651).

The Agreement provides for, under specified conditions, the waiver of duties, the limitation of application of internal taxes, the granting of procedures and the facilitation of customs clearance of the educational, scientific, and cultural materials specified in the five Annexes to the Agreement. Annex A covers Books, Publications and Documents; Annex B, Works of Art and Collectors Pieces of an educational, scientific and cultural character; Annex C, Visual and Auditory Materials of an educational, scientific and cultural character; Annex D, Scientific Instruments or Apparatus for educational or pure scientific research; and Annex E, Articles for the Blind. A UNESCO conference in 1973 recommended that the Agreement should be examined for its "possible extension" to additional categories of materials in view of technological progress since 1950 and the desirability of further exchanges of scientific, educational, and cultural materials. Authorized by a 1974 conference, UNESCO circulated an initial draft Protocol in 1975 and a meeting of government experts developed a formal draft in March, 1976.

The 1976 Protocol: On November 30, 1976, the General Conference of UNESCO, meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, approved a Protocol to the Florence Agreement of 1950 that will, when it comes into effect, eliminate additional import tariffs and other barriers to the international flow of scientific, educational, and cultural materials. The Protocol now is open to ratification and acceptance by countries that are already parties to the basic Florence Agreement, as well as by economic and tariff unions (such as the European Economic Community). At present, the basic Agreement is in effect in 69 countries. The Protocol will come into operation as between the ratifying states six months after the deposit of the fifth instrument of ratification with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

In the United States, the practice of recent years will probably be followed: a two-step procedure requiring first the approval of the Protocol by the Senate as a treaty, and then passage of an implementing Act by both Houses of Congress making the required changes in U.S. import duties. Since the Department of State and other Federal departments and agencies and the principal U.S. organizations of producers and consumers of the materials affected by the Protocol have supported its provisions, there would seem to be no reason why the approval of the Congress should not be quickly obtained.

Some of the most important provisions of the Protocol, from the point of view of publishers, producers of audiovisual materials, libraries, and educational institutions, deal with import duties on audiovisual materials and microforms, and with import licenses and exchange restrictions.

Under the present text of the Agreement, audiovisual materials receive less favorable treatment than books and other publications, which are relieved of import duties without certification of their educational, cultural, or scientific character and without respect to who may import them. For audiovisual materials and microforms, on the other hand, under the present text of the Agreement, the elimination of import duties is required only if these materials are of an "educational, scientific, or cultural character;" and only when imported by institutions "approved by the competent authorities of the importing country . . . exclusively for exhibition by these organizations or by other public or private educational scientific or cultural institutions." Thus, a double limitation is applied to the duty-free importation or audiovisual and microform publications.

The Protocol contains two alternative provisions (Annex C-1 and Annex C-2) with respect to audiovisual materials, one of which must be accepted. The C-2 alternative continues the double limitation mentioned above, but does add to the list of audiovisual materials in the present text a number of additional materials that were nonexistent or insignificant when the original agreement was drafted. The other alternative on audiovisual materials (C-1) gives all audiovisual materials the same duty-free treatment presently accorded books, lifting the present double limitation. The following U.S. organizations are on record as favoring U.S. adherence to the C-1 alternative: the Association of Media Producers, the Motion Picture Association of America, the Record Industry Association of America, the Association of American Publishers, the Association for Educational Communication and Technology, and the American Library Association.

With respect to microforms, the Protocol has two components. One would give duty-free treatment to microforms of published materials, such as books and periodicals, without requiring they be of an educational, cultural, or scientific character, or be imported by approved institutions. In other words, microform publications are to be given the same treatment as printed publications. The second component would add duty-free treatment of certain other materials, such as "microcards, microfiche, and magnetic or perforated tapes and cards required in computerized information and documentation services" under the heading of audiovisual materials. These additional types of materials would thus be subject to treatment either under Annex C-1 or C-2.

The present text of the Agreement contains relatively little on import licenses and exchange restrictions. It merely requires that import licenses and foreign exchange be made available for the importation of government official documents, United Nations and affiliated agencies official documents, publications in raised characters for the blind, other articles for the blind imported by approved institutions, travel promotion literature and, most important, books and publications consigned to public libraries of public educational, research, or cultural institutions.

The Protocol contains an optional provision (Part II) extending the requirement that import licenses and foreign exchange be provided for the importation of the following additional categories of materials: 1) books and publications consigned to an expanded list of types of libraries; 2) adopted textbooks imported by higher education institutions; 3) books in foreign languages; and 4) audiovisual materials of an educational, scientific, or cultural nature imported by approved institutions.

The United States does not require import licenses or impose limitations on the securing of foreign exchange for the importation of the kinds of materials covered by the Florence Agreement and the Protocol. Therefore, on the import side, there would be no change from the present situation. With respect to exports, however, many other countries do require import licenses and impose restrictions on obtaining foreign exchange. Therefore, the adoption of this proposal in other countries that have such limitations would be beneficial to U.S. producers of books and audiovisual materials, since the United States is a major exporter of these products.

Another optional provision of the Protocol—Annex E—would for the first time provide for the duty-free flow of "articles specially designed for the education, employment and social advancement of other physically and mentally handicapped persons . . .," provided that equivalent articles are not being manufactured in the countries of importation. Presently among handicapped persons, only the blind benefit from the original Florence Agreement.

Attached is the text of a draft resolution placing the White House Conference on Library and Information Services on record as supporting early congressional action to place the provisions of the Protocol, including Annex C-1, into force in this country.

ADDENDUM:

Proposed Resolution:
Protocol to the Florence Agreement
Approved by the General Conference of UNESCO, November 30, 1976

Whereas, the Florence Agreement (Agreement of the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials) by eliminating import duties on books, periodicals, printed music, and other educational, scientific, and cultural materials in the United States and 68 other adhering countries has provided great benefits to libraries and their users, as well as to educational institutions and the general public; and

Whereas, a 1976 Protocol (supplement) to the Florence Agreement which, among other improvements, extends duty-free status to audiovisual and microform materials without limitation in optional Annex C-1, is now open to accession by the United States and other countries; and

Whereas, the Association of Media Producers, the Motion Picture Association of America, the Record Industry Association of America, the Association of American Publishers, the Authors Guild, the Association for Educational Communication and Technology, and the American Library Association have vigorously supported United States adherence to the Protocol, including optional Annex C-1;

Therefore be it resolved, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services urges the Department of State to submit the Florence Agreement Protocol and the necessary implementing legislation to the United States Congress for approval early in 1980; and

Be it further resolved, that the Department of State recommend that the United States adopt the more liberal Annex C-1 of the Protocol relating to audiovisual and microform materials; and

Be it further resolved, that the Senate be respectfully urged to act promptly to approve the Protocol as a treaty, and both Houses of Congress be respectfully urged to approve the implementing legislation.

Robert W. Frase

Testimony Submitted by Thomas J. Galvin

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services takes place amid growing recognition of the importance and centrality of information services in American life. The level of literacy required and the sophistication of the information needed to function effectively in today's complex society are increasing steadily. The delegates to this Conference have the opportunity to help determine the place of libraries in an information society. Our libraries, many of which are now in serious financial peril, are national resources that America must save and strengthen.

The Federal Government has a continuing responsibility for the quality of library and information services available to all Americans. In establishing the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Congress recognized that responsibility and affirmed in Public Law 91-345: ". . . that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services."

Most recently, President Carter in his message to Congress on October 31, 1979, (House Document 96-214) set forth a broad Government program to spur industrial innovation in America. Among the President's proposals is the establishment of nonprofit centers to help provide more comprehensive dissemination of technical information that can be used by industry. With Federal assistance, libraries could help achieve this and other national goals such as disseminating information on energy conservation, reducing adult illiteracy, providing essential societal information to the disadvantaged, the elderly, the handicapped, and assuring a quality education for the young.

One major proposal concerning the Federal role in support of libraries is before this Conference as S. 1124, the National Library Act. This study bill has a number of interesting, significant, and important aspects that merit thoughtful consideration and exploration. It suggests the creation of a new national library agency as the locus of Federal library activity. However, events subsequent to the introduction of S. 1124 provide a new and timely opportunity for a locus of responsibility, and demonstrate how difficult it is to create a new bureaucracy. The lengthy and sometimes acrimonious history of the legislation creating a Department of Education (Public Law 96-88) demonstrates that it is almost impossible to consolidate widely scattered programs with their own supporters in Congress and their respective constituencies in the field.

The new Department of Education, which is just now getting organized, offers an immediate opportunity for a strengthened administrative unit for Federal library programs. Some of the functions envisioned for the proposed national library agency could be handled very effectively by an expanded Office of Libraries and Learning Resources at the Assistant Secretary level within the new department. A proposed resolution to this effect is attached to my statement for consideration by the delegates to this Conference.

ALA recognizes that under the time constraints of a White House Conference, delegates will not be able to work out all the detailed issues raised by S. 1124. ALA recommends that all interested parties be called upon to work out specific provisions for implementing legislation after the Conference, based on priorities set and directions recommended by the delegates. The authorizations for existing library legislation allow time for thorough consideration of WHCLIS recommendations after the Conference. For instance, the Library Services and Construction Act is authorized through fiscal year 1982; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (including school library assistance) through FY 1983; the Higher Education Act (including aid to college and research libraries and library training and demonstrations) through FY 1985 after a pending reauthorization measure is enacted next year. In addition, all these programs are subject to an automatic one-year extension.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science has already demonstrated leadership in bringing together interested constituencies on important issues, as evidenced by the Open Forum held last March on the proposed National Periodical Center. NCLIS could be called on again to hold an open forum on implementation issues of the National Library Act or other legislative proposals recommended by WHCLIS delegates.

In the meantime, the importance of a strong expression of support by WHCLIS delegates for increased funding for existing library programs cannot be overemphasized. The President's FY 1981 budget, now being developed by the Office of Management and Budget for transmittal to Congress in January, is expected to contain sharp reductions in library funding—this in the year of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services! The school library program would be cut in half, for instance, and library training and demonstrations would be zero funded.

New legislative initiatives should be anticipated by increasing the funding for existing programs, so that there will be money in the bank, so to speak, to transfer to new programs which may be recommended at this Conference. Even if enacted into law, Congress would be reluctant to fund a new program if the level of funding required were too great a jump over current levels of Federal support.

A proposed resolution on funding of Federal library programs is attached to my statement, along with several others suggested because current Federal legislative developments make them timely and appropriate. We hope that all of these draft resolutions can be considered by the delegates to this White House Conference.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the American Library Association.

ADDENDUM:

Observations on S. 1124, National Library Act

Brief Summary of S. 1124: The National Library Act, a legislative proposal initiated by the National Citizens Emergency Committee to Save Our Public Libraries, headed by Whitney North Seymour, Jr., was introduced last May as a study bill for WHCLIS discussion by Senators Jacob Javits (R-NY) and Edward Kennedy (D-MA). S. 1124 would replace the Library Services and Construction Act with an expanded program of aid to public libraries administered by a new National Library Agency, with a presidentially-appointed director and board. The bill would provide for direct financial assistance to public libraries for operating expenses on a matching 20 percent Federal, 50 percent State, 30 percent local basis. In additional titles it would continue public library construction assistance, establish grants for services to special constituencies, assist interlibrary cooperation including development and maintenance of library and information networks, and fund special training programs for library personnel.

Summary of ALA Observations: The American Library Association applauds this legislative initiative and generally supports many of the concepts embodied in S. 1124. However, ALA suggests an alternative to creation of a new National Library Agency—and that is a strengthened Office of Libraries and Learning Resources within the newly created Department of Education. ALA also recognizes that the many detailed questions raised by S. 1124 cannot be worked out to everyone's satisfaction, given the limited time in a White House Conference forum. Based on priorities and directions recommended by delegates, all interested parties can be called upon to work out specific provisions of implementing legislation after the Conference.

The National Library Agency—an Alternative: The National Library Agency would be given authority to administer a number of library-related functions now housed in a variety of existing agencies (including Library of Congress, National Library of Medicine, National Agricultural Library, Government Printing Office, International Communications Agency, National Endowment for the Humanities, and National Center for Education Statistics). The history of the legislation creating a Department of Education demonstrates that it is almost impossible to consolidate widely scattered programs with their own supporters in Congress and their own constituencies in the field.

However, the Department of Education also offers an opportunity for a strengthened administrative unit for Federal library programs. Some of the functions envisioned for the proposed National Library Agency could be handled very effectively by an expanded Office of Libraries and Learning Resources under an Assistant Secretary within the new department. A change from proposing a controversial new bureaucracy to this more realistic alternative would increase the chances for the rest of the bill.

Details of S. 1124 Will Require Further Scrutiny: In order to make the most productive use of scarce WHCLIS time, delegates will have to concentrate in discussions and resolutions on the principles, rather than the details of the study bill. Based on priorities set and directions recommended by WHCLIS delegates, interested parties can be called upon to work out specific provisions of implementing legislation after the Conference. The existing Library Services and Construction Act is authorized through Fiscal Year 1982, with an automatic one-year extension. Thus, there is time to give the details the careful and thorough scrutiny they deserve by all interested constituencies after the Conference.

Questions Raised by S. 1124: The study bill has been "studied" by several groups within the library community; numerous questions have been raised and should be discussed. Some issues will undoubtedly be aired at the White House Conference; others can be hammered out at a later open forum of interested constituencies. Among the questions raised are the following:

1) The concept of Federal incentives for increased State support of public library services is a good one, but questions have come up about the specific 20/50/30 Federal/State/local funding formula proposed in S. 1124. The State share would increase to 50 percent over five years. Would this provision have the support of the Nation's governors? of State legislators?

2) Under the existing Library Services and Construction Act, the Federal share ranges from 33 to 66 percent. Under the National Library Act, it would decrease from 30 to 20 percent over five years. Are the States willing to make such a change?

3) States which are unable or unwilling to provide 50 percent of the funding would lose the entire Federal contribution except for a small basic allotment. How many States might be in this situation?

4) Are funds to be distributed by the State library agency to individual libraries on a per capita basis, as promotional materials indicate? or according to priorities in the State plan, as the bill itself seems to indicate?

5) States and localities vary tremendously in terms of needs and ability to support libraries. Is imposition of a national per capita standard as required by the bill realistic at this time?

6) How does the additional authority given State library agencies in the development and maintenance of cooperative library networks impact on interstate, regional, and other existing network configurations?

7) Increasing the number of titles in Federal public library assistance legislation increases the range of services aided and enhances the potential for funding. But it also increases the chances that the Administration or Congress may recommend funding for one or more titles but not for all, depending on current priorities and budgetary pressures. What are the tradeoffs here?

The following resolutions are recommended to the delegates because legislation recently passed or pending, or recent legislative history, makes them timely and appropriate. No attempt is made to establish WHCLIS priorities, but only to identify issues relating to current federal legislation on which a strong WHCLIS statement would have a definite impact.

Proposed Resolution
on Libraries within the Department of Education

Whereas, American libraries have long served as an indispensable element in both formal and lifelong education, and the importance of libraries in the educational process has long been recognized by the Federal Government; and

Whereas, libraries are a cross-cutting function providing support for all levels and forms of education, and have elements in common with other cross-cutting functions such as education technology, telecommunications demonstrations, education information centers, and literacy activities; and

Whereas, the newly-created Cabinet-level Department of Education provides an opportunity for rethinking and restructuring cross-cutting functions such as libraries;

Therefore be it resolved, that WHCLIS delegates support the expansion of the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources under the direction of an Assistant Secretary within the new Department of Education, and call upon Congress and the Administration to take favorable action in support of this resolution.

Rationale: Support of this resolution by WHCLIS delegates is needed and could not be more timely. A transition team is already at work on the internal organization of the new department, and confirmation hearings for the Secretary-designate, California Judge Shirley Hufstedler, have been scheduled for November 20 by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee.

The new department, signed into law by President Carter on October 17 (P.L. 96-88), transfers and consolidates some 170 Federal education programs. As finally approved by Congress, the new Secretary is given the power to consolidate, alter, discontinue, or reallocate the functions of a number of statutory entities, including the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, after giving 90 days notice to House and Senate authorizing committees.

The Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, although mandated by the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380), has had an up-and-down history of reorganization and low priority status within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The status of the library unit within the new Department of Education is still very much up in the air.

The American Library Association, in a resolution adopted by ALA Council in January, 1979, supported the creation of a separate department and recommended that the library unit be elevated in status and combined with education technology and nontraditional learning. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science has also recommended that the library unit be placed at the level of Assistant Secretary within the new Department of Education.

Proposed Resolution on a National Periodical Center

Whereas, the national welfare is inextricably linked with ready access to information in periodicals which have become the single most dominant medium for communicating research results; and

Whereas, existing interlibrary loan mechanisms for the dissemination of periodical information are inadequate and increasingly unable to meet the demand placed on them; and

Whereas, the public welfare can best be served when the profit and not-for-profit sectors act in partnership in the dissemination of information;

Therefore be it resolved, that WHCLIS delegates support the establishment of a National Periodical Center and call upon Congress and the Administration to take favorable action in support of this resolution.

Rationale: The House passed, on November 7, an extension of the Higher Education Act, H.R. 5192, which included as part D of title II a National Periodical Center. The Senate has completed hearings on HEA extension, including the NPC proposal, but has not yet developed its own bill.

Organizations which have endorsed the NPC concept include the following: American Library Association, Association of Research Libraries, Association of American Universities, Medical Library Association, Special Libraries Association, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, Center for Research Libraries, and Universal Serials and Book Exchange, Inc. Endorsement by WHCLIS delegates would send a clear message to the Senate that library users would benefit from a National Periodical Center.

The bill passed by the House would establish an independent non-profit corporation which would serve as a national lending resource by providing improved access to periodical literature. The corporation would have a 15-member board of directors appointed by the President, with representation from the government, academic, and research communities, libraries, publishers, the information community, authors, and the public.

The NPC would be authorized to acquire, preserve, and make available periodicals and journals through its own dedicated collection and by cooperation with local, State, and regional library systems, national libraries, private commercial suppliers, and other periodical service agencies. Necessary copyright fees would be paid.

The bill authorizes appropriations of $15 million each year through Fiscal Year 1985. It could be funded only if parts A, B, and C of HEA title II were funded at no lower than the FY 1979 levels. These levels are $9.975 million for II-A college library resources, $3 million for II-B library training and demonstrations, and $6 million for the II-C research library program.

Proposed Resolution on Preferential Telecommunications Rates

Whereas, in a democratic society an informed citizenry is basic to the national interest; and

Whereas, libraries collectively are a major disseminator of occupational, educational, and recreational information to the American people; and

Whereas, today's libraries are no longer just repositories for books but sources of information with emphasis on access and communication; and

Whereas, the enormous proliferation and fragmentation of knowledge, the increasing sophistication of information necessary to function in today's complex society, and the explosive development of information and communication technologies to meet these demands, all make use of telecommunications technologies by libraries essential; and

Whereas, ample precedent exists in public laws and regulatory policy for giving special recognition to nonprofit libraries and educational institutions as they carry out their responsibilities to the public,

Therefore be it resolved, that WHCLIS delegates call upon Congress and the Administration to establish by statute the ability for common carriers to provide preferential rates for nonprofit libraries and educational institutions in their uses of telecommunications channels of all types for interinstitutional transmissions and for the distribution of information to the public.

Rationale: In keeping with our national goal to conserve energy, it is doubly important that libraries provide information to the public in the most efficient ways possible. Through the use of telecommunications, libraries might reach people in their homes and at their places of work as an alternative to requiring citizens to travel long distances to libraries. The emphasis should be on moving information to people rather than moving people to information, especially to reach the homebound, handicapped, and elderly, as well as citizens in remote rural areas.

Today's libraries are interactive sources of information which rely more and more heavily on the new technologies as means to library access and for information dissemination. The explosive development of information and communication technologies, including cable television, mini- and microcomputers, video cassette technology, video discs, and satellite communication will increasingly make possible heretofore unexplored possibilities for access to information by the public. Automated library networks that supply cataloging, ordering, and other kinds of bibliographic information to libraries via on-line computer facilities are already operating in many areas of the country. It is imperative, therefore, that libraries be assured of the ready availability of reliable and affordable communications channels.

There is clear precedent in the statutes and regulations for special recognition for libraries and educational institutions in several closely related areas. Some examples follow:

Public Broadcasting: The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 states that AT&T, in providing the interconnection for public broadcasting, could do so under preferential rates.

Communications Satellite Facilities: In the Federal Communications Commission's Second Report and Order on Docket 16495, June 16, 1972, in the matter of the "Establishment of Domestic Communications Satellite Facilities by Nongovernmental Entities," paragraph E, page 10, entitled *Terms of Access by Public Broadcasting and Other Educational Interests,* provides: ". . . we recognize that there is a well-established national policy, incorporated in legislation, which encourages and makes it lawful for common carriers to provide free or reduced rate interconnection services to public broadcasting and other educational interests. These statutes make it possible for the Commission to prescribe preferential rates for educational entities covered by such legislation, as well as for carriers to file tariffs offering free or reduced rates to such entities on their own initiative."

Networks for Knowledge: In a previous extension (P.L. 90-575) of the Higher Education Act, title VIII, Networks for Knowledge, encouraged colleges and universities and their libraries to share to an optimal extent, through cooperative arrangements, their technical and other educational and administrative facilities and resources. Grants were authorized for sharing through a variety of telecommunications technologies, including rapid transmission of library materials, closed-circuit television, and electronic computer networks. Section 803, "Authority for Free or Reduced Rate Communications Interconnection Services," reads as follows:

"Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prevent United States communications common carriers from rendering, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe, free or reduced rate communications interconnection services for interconnection systems within the purview of this title, whether or not included in a project for which a grant is made under this title."

Although title VIII has expired for lack of funding, the need for such authority still remains and the rationale is still valid.

Postal Rates: The legislative history of the Act creating the U.S. Postal Service and subsequent reorganizational criteria authorize and urge the Postal Rate and Service Commission to establish postal rates that reflect the educational and cultural value of books and materials and to establish preferential library rates, even if such rates involve subsidization of service. Accordingly, Congress provides preferential postal rates for libraries and educational institutions.

Copyright Fair Use Privileges: In the 1976 Copyright Law (P.L. 94-553), Congress made a clear distinction between the nonprofit and the commercial sectors in dealing with the uses of copyrighted materials. The law contains certain safeguards for librarians, teachers, and researchers in their uses of materials.

Surplus Property: The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (P.L. 87-786 as amended) in section 203(j)(3) permits libraries, like other educational institutions, to receive both real and personal surplus property.

Most recently, President Carter in his message to Congress on October 31 (H. Doc. 96-214) set forth a broad Government program to spur industrial innovation in America. Among the President's proposals is the establishment of nonprofit centers to help provide more comprehensive dissemination of technical information that can be used by industry. Libraries could serve as such nonprofit centers but to function adequately in this role, they would need the use of telecommunications channels at reduced rates.

Proposed Resolution on Postal Reform Legislation

Whereas, libraries are dependent on the U.S. mails for receipt of materials from publishers and distributors, for interlibrary loans, and for direct library service to geographically isolated or homebound patrons; and

Whereas, current law (P.L. 94-421) requires that the "educational, cultural, scientific, and informational value to the recipient of mail matter" be taken into consideration in setting postal rates; and

Whereas, the House of Representatives recently passed by an overwhelming margin a bill (H.R. 79) which would increase the public service subsidy to the U.S. Postal Service, extend the phased rate increases for fourth-class book and library rates over a longer period of time, and make further improvements to the library rate including extending it to books sent *from* libraries and educational institutions as well as *to* them;

Therefore be it resolved, that WHCLIS delegates respectfully urge that the U.S. Senate pass legislation during the 96th Congress similar to H.R. 79, the Postal Service Act of 1979.

Rationale: The House has twice passed needed postal reform legislation. Last year the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee reported a similar measure, but it did not reach the Senate floor. Senator John Glenn's Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services, which handles postal legislation, has taken no action yet this year. Meanwhile, the public service appropriation for the U.S. Postal Service declined this Fiscal Year by $92 million; the library rate increased an average of 22 percent in July of this year, and the book rate, 24 percent.

If finally approved by Congress, H.R. 79 would correct a misinterpretation of present law and allow libraries to return books to publishers and distributors at the library rate. It is ironic that libraries, for whom the library rate was intended, must use the higher book rate to return such materials. H.R. 79 would also make clear that all libraries, and not just public libraries, are eligible for the library rate. Finally, it would enable libraries and educational institutions to send and receive additional materials, including book catalogs, teaching aids, and science kits, under the library rate.

Over 30 organizations are on record in support of postal reform legislation such as H.R. 79. The list includes: American Library Association, Association of American Publishers, National Education Association, Classroom Publishers Association, Magazine Publishers Association, American Booksellers Association, and several postal workers unions and postmasters and postal supervisors associations.

Libraries in major metropolitan areas are often well served by delivery services of large book distributors or United Parcel Service, but libraries in more sparsely populated areas are totally dependent on USPS. In addition, the increasing price and dwindling supply of gasoline has caused some library systems to cut back bookmobile service and increase use of books-by-mail to isolated or homebound users.

Proposed Resolution
on Literary, Musical, and Artistic Donations to Libraries

Whereas, prior to the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-172), an author or artist who donated his or her literary, musical, or artistic compositions or papers to a library or museum could take a tax deduction equal to the fair market value of the items at the time of the contribution; and

Whereas, since 1969 such deductions have been limited to the cost of the materials used to produce the compositions, and donations to libraries have been severely reduced; and

Whereas, an entire generation of literary papers may be lost to future scholars through lack of an incentive to donate them to libraries; and

Whereas, restoration of a tax incentive would contribute to the equitable tax treatment of authors and artists, and would increase public access to and preservation of the Nation's literary and artistic legacy;

Therefore be it resolved, that the U.S. Congress enact legislation restoring a tax incentive for authors and artists to donate their creative works to libraries and museums.

Rationale: Bills are pending in both the House and the Senate which would restore a tax incentive. These measures are supported by the American Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, the Library of Congress, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Council of Creative Artists, Libraries, and Museums (composed of 18 affiliated organizations). However, small tax bills such as these (H.R. 2498; S. 1078) tend to get stuck in the process unless widespread support can be demonstrated. WHCLIS endorsement would indicate interest by library users and lay citizens.

Specific instances of manuscript collection losses directly attributable to lack of tax deductions have been cited by many libraries. Those specializing in contemporary literature, art, and music have experienced a definite decline since 1969. However, the number of authors, artists, and composers who may have come forward with manuscript donations had the Tax Reform Act not been in effect will never be fully known.

Some authors are selling their manuscripts to the highest bidder. This means an author's manuscripts may be split up, may no longer be available in the State or region where they were produced, may even be sold out of the country, and may be inaccessible to researchers because of owners' restrictions.

With tighter budgets, libraries are at a disadvantage in competing for manuscripts offered for sale. Some authors have placed collections "on deposit" in libraries, hoping for a change in the tax laws. Such deposit collections are of limited benefit to scholars, because libraries are reluctant to spend time and money organizing collections which may later be withdrawn.

Proposed Resolution
on Revision of Title 44, Public Printing and Documents

Whereas, the Federal Government collects, compiles, and produces information on every subject which pertains to life in our society; and

Whereas, free access to government information is crucial to informed public decisionmaking in a democratic society; and

Whereas, libraries, including depository libraries, play a significant role in making this information available to the public; and

Whereas, the U.S. Congress is presently engaged in a comprehensive review of the *U.S. Code,* Title 44, "Public Printing and Documents," with the stated purpose of providing for improved administration of public printing services and distribution of public documents;

Therefore be it resolved, that WHCLIS delegates call upon Congress and the Administration to enact legislation requiring:

1) a system of free, equal, effective, and efficient distribution to depository libraries which permits full and free access to government publications in all formats including print, microform, on-line data files, audio and visual presentations, or other means of information transfer;

2) the periodic publication of a comprehensive listing and description of all government publications produced;

3) the continuation of the present system of in-depth regional depository collections and support services, and local selective depository libraries through which government information can be made available to the public;

4) the establishment of a comprehensive current and retrospective collection of government-produced publications to serve depository libraries and the public nationwide as a source for reference and referral service, interlibrary loan, photoduplication, and telefacsimile or other transmission systems; and

5) the establishment of a comprehensive centralized or coordinated sales program to offer basic Federal documents on a subsidized basis, and all other Federal Government publications in whatever format, for sale on a cost recovery basis so that non profit libraries are able to continue acquiring them for use by the public.

Rationale: Congress is now in the process of revising Title 44 of the *U.S. Code,* "Public Printing and Documents." Title 44 is the *U.S. Code* section dealing most broadly with such library/citizen-oriented policies as the printing, listing, pricing, and distribution of government publications. Each resolve clause above addresses a particular issue or set of issues involved in the pending revision of Title 44.

Resolve clause "1)" focuses on the materials available under the depository library program, a part of Title 44. Many products that were once produced in traditional book format and distributed to depository libraries are now on microfiche or computer tape. As new technology changes the format in which government publications or information products are produced, it is essential that the public continue to have access to them through local libraries.

Clause "2)" focuses on what is perhaps a root cause of the problems of public access to government publications, the lack of any comprehensive listing. Government studies have demonstrated the failure of many agencies to keep track of their own publishing activities. It is difficult for libraries to meet public needs when no authoritative listing of what exists is published.

The successes of the present depository library program are greatly strengthened by the pending legislation, but the existence of regional depository in-depth collections and support services is not explicitly retained. Resolve clause "3)" supports the local/regional service structure, while clause "4)" supports the congressional intent to establish one national center as a backup for the entire system. The revision legislation should stipulate that an intermediate service level between local libraries and the national center should be retained. At present there is *no* source to which the public or the Nation's libraries may turn for all government publications.

Resolve clause "5)" calls for a sales program much like that which exists under current law. The pricing structure is quickly raising costs above the means of individuals and small libraries. Because information generated during the course of government business is not a consumable commodity, making its existence known and available reaps the greatest benefit from the tax dollars spent on its generation. Freely accessible government information increases accountability, while also raising the consciousness of the public in topics ranging from the arts to zoology. That public is as diverse as are the delegates to the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Proposed Resolution
on Pricing of Basic Government Publications

Whereas, broad public participation in government is essential to the effective functioning of a democracy; and

Whereas, the Nation's libraries provide students, scholars, and the general public with free and equal access to the printed record of the Federal Government; and

Whereas, fewer than eight percent of the 18,000 public libraries, branches, and college libraries in the United States are eligible to receive one copy of the *Congressional Record, Federal Register*, and other basic publications free through the depository library program; and

Whereas, House Report 96-245 urges that the Public Printer raise the price of these and other subsidized publications to fully recover costs; and

Whereas, this action would limit the number of libraries able to afford these publications, thus lessening public access to those fundamental tools of democracy;

Therefore be it resolved, that the U.S. Congress continue to foster broad public participation in the Federal Government by substantial subsidies on the sale of basic Federal documents.

Rationale: There have been several attempts over the past decade to increase the price of basic Federal publications significantly. For instance, the *Federal Register* rose from $15 annually in 1968 to $50 annually in 1976. The push toward total cost recovery was voiced once again in House Report 96-245, which accompanied the FY 1980 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill in June of this year. The price of the *Federal Register* alone would approach $150 annually under such a full cost recovery move.

In recent years, Congress has also taken many steps to assure increased availability of Government information on an equal basis to all citizens. These moves assume widespread availability of basic Federal Government publications. The principle that broad access to information on matters of government encourages more participation in government and heightened accountability of government is being explicitly applied in legislation. For example, implementation of the Privacy Act (P.L. 93-579) is dependent upon agency rules published in the *Federal Register* "in a form available to the public at low cost." Also, shorter deadlines for public comment on proposed regulations are becoming more common in an effort to speed up the regulatory process. Such a reform assumes that the public has unhampered access to the proposals in the *Federal Register*.

The prices of the most basic Federal Government publications, the *Congressional Record, Federal Register, Code of Federal Regulations, U.S. Government Manual, Weekly Compilation of*

Presidential Documents, and others are already far too high for many libraries, especially those in small communities and rural areas without easy access to the larger depository libraries.

Proposed Resolution
on the Florence Protocol

Whereas, the Florence Agreement (Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials), by eliminating import duties on books, periodicals, printed music, and other educational, scientific, and cultural materials in the U.S. and 68 other adhering countries, has provided great benefits to libraries and their users, as well as to educational institutions and the general public; and

Whereas, a 1976 Protocol (supplement) to the Florence Agreement which, among other improvements, extends duty free status to audio, visual, and microform materials without limitation in optional Annex C-1 is now open to accession by the United States and other countries;

Therefore be it resolved, that WHCLIS delegates urge the Department of State to submit the Florence Agreement Protocol and the necessary implementing legislation to the U.S. Congress for approval early in 1980; and

Be it further resolved, that the Department of State recommend that the United States adopt the more liberal Annex C-1 of the Protocol relating to audio, visual, and microform materials; and

Be it further resolved, that the Senate be respectfully urged to act promptly to approve the Protocol as a treaty, and both Houses of Congress be respectfully urged to approve the implementing legislation.

Rationale: The Florence Protocol is a benefit to libraries and their users which exists on the books, but will not take effect between the ratifying states until after the fifth ratification. In the United States, the process is not a speedy one, but it could be started any tme—thus the rationale for WHCLIS support.

After receiving the Protocol from the State Department, the Senate must approve it as a treaty, and then implementing legislation making the required changes in United States import duties must be passed by both Houses of Congress.

Among the organizations which have supported United States adherence to the Protocol, including optional Annex C-1, are the American Library Association, the Association of Media Producers, the Motion Picture Association of America, the Record Industry Association of America, the Association of American Publishers, the Authors Guild, and the Association for Educational Communication and Technology.

Proposed Resolution on Funding of Federal Library Programs

Whereas, an informed citizenry is essential in a democratic society; and

Whereas, the level of literacy necessary to function effectively in today's complex society is steadily rising; and

Whereas, it is a priority of both Congress and the Administration to improve the basic learning skills of elementary and secondary school students, and to reduce adult illiteracy; and

Whereas, basic skills and literacy cannot be improved without a commitment to library support; and

Whereas, reports of preliminary Federal budget figures for Fiscal Year 1981 indicate sharp reductions in library funding;

Therefore be it resolved, that WHCLIS delegates call upon Congress and the Administration to restore and increase funds for Federal library programs to ensure effective library and information services for all citizens.

Rationale: The President's budget, to be released in January, is expected to contain sharp reductions in library funding below already inadequate levels—in this year of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services! For instance, a national newsletter has already reported that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-B, school library resources program will be pegged at $90 million—compared with the current level of $171 million. The Higher Education Act, Title II-B, library training and demonstration program, currently just $1 million, would be zero funded.

The importance of strong support by WHCLIS delegates for increased funding for existing Federal library programs cannot be overemphasized. New legislative initiatives which may be recommended by WHCLIS should be anticipated by increasing the funding for existing programs so that there will be money in the bank, so to speak, to transfer to new programs. Even if enacted into law, Congress would be reluctant to fund a new program if the level of support required were too great a jump over current levels of Federal support.

In recent years, public, school, and academic libraries have seen a decline both in actual budget dollars and in the purchasing power of the funds they receive. Over the past five years, the average book price rose 43 percent, the average periodical subscription 56 percent, while the overall inflation rate rose 32 percent during the same period. These costs are uncontrollable, no matter how prudently library management watches its dollars. People most in need of services—the poor, the elderly, the handicapped, the newcomers with little or no English, the disadvantaged student—find that the special materials suited to their needs may no longer be acquired because funds are not available to carry out such programs.

Libraries are an essential component of any national literacy effort and could, with increased support, do more to help develop an effective and informed citizenry. The Administration proposed and Congress enacted recently a new basic skills improvement program, but basic skills and literacy cannot be improved without appropriate library resources.

Thomas J. Galvin
American Library Association

Testimony Submitted by Margaret Knox Goggin

Education Issues for Library Media Information Management

The effective provision of library and information services to meet the current and future needs of citizens will be largely dependent upon the availability of competent staff to provide these services. The growing complexities of the information-based society, the changing needs of citizens, the new technological applications for information delivery, these and many more factors are dramatically changing the role of libraries and information agencies and are demanding new kinds of education and reeducation of librarians and information managers.

In whatever ways the issues of this week's deliberations are articulated, the emergent needs will require personnel prepared at graduate professional programs at the master's, post-master's, or doctoral level, and staff whose competence is continually updated and reviewed through career-long continuing library education.

The Federal Government through the years has recognized that the formal graduate professional preparation for information professionals is a national concern and a national responsibility. The Higher Education Act has provided modest scholarship and fellowship support to graduate schools of library and information science to assist highly qualified students to prepare for a career in libraries and information agencies.

The Association of American Library Schools affirms the national characteristics of graduate education for this profession and considers it essential for the Federal Government to support with increased vigor their national responsibility for the preparation of competent, dynamic leaders for the information agencies of today and tomorrow.

Graduate schools in all professions have been successful in developing creative and dynamic leaders when they have recruited students from all parts of the country, from diverse cultural heritages, and from a variety of social backgrounds. Professional growth is stimulated as the New Englander discusses library experiences with the Montana rancher and the Mississippi delta native; when the Black from Atlanta works with other minorities from New Mexico, California, and Chicago to study new ways of delivering information to special clienteles.

We need to bring divergent views to bear on professional education. Students must come from a multiplicity of backgrounds with understanding and sensitivity to special groups in our society, such as the ethnic minorities, the blind or physically handicapped, the rural isolate, the urban ghetto residents, etc.

From these divergent backgrounds, the highly qualified student should be recruited with the assurance that assistance in meeting the financial demands of a graduate professional education will be available. Graduate students vary greatly in their ability to fund their own education, and institutions of higher education are finding their own funds for student financial aid more and more restricted. If only students who can afford to pay the costs of graduate education from personal resources pursue library and information education, valuable human resources will be lost to library and information services.

We are presenting a resolution on Federal support programs of scholarships and fellowships for graduate education of information professionals.

Vitally important to the process of educating competent staff for libraries and information agencies is the quality teaching faculty at graduate schools of library and information science. The development and maintenance of faculties with competence in all areas of library theory and practice, with growing and developing concepts of information needs, with knowledge and ability in areas of information management, information delivery systems, etc., require a continuous and vigorous recruiting of gifted persons into our graduate schools, and financial support for those advanced students who have teaching career goals.

Faculties must include persons with the necessary commitment and competence to conduct research and to interpret the findings of research to practitioners through publication and demonstration. The dynamic character of our field demands that faculty be continually improving and updating their knowledge, their competencies, their research and writing skills, and their understanding of professional problems of today and tomorrow. The need for faculty development programs, recognized as essential to quality professional education in all professions, is equally essential to our field.

Of crucial importance to the development of library and information services to meet the information needs of citizens is planned critical research into the broad range of problems associated with information delivery and use. Graduate schools of library and information science have played an important role in providing staff for research and in conducting significant research studies. No profession can respond to dynamic changes in the nature of its services without a rigorous and active research program, both basic and applied. Support for research must be increased immeasurably if we are to develop new services, new methods of accessing and delivering information, in constructive and beneficial ways. We urge greater support from the Federal Government for research into the problems, needs, and services for information in the 1980's and beyond.

The successful implementation of the programs, services, and national plans which may come out of the discussions and resolutions for the White House Conference depends upon a highly qualified staff in all libraries and information agencies. The library education community represented by Association of American Library Schools is committed to contribute to the evolution of librarianship through the continued development of highly qualified personnel, the active engagement in the continuing education of staffs, and in the conduct of basic and applied research. It is a real challenge for the 1980's, and we solicit the support of all White House Conference on Library and Information Services delegates in the years ahead.

ADDENDUM:

Proposed Resolution on Support for Education for Library and Information Professionals

The Association of American Library Schools recommends that WHCLIS delegates adopt the following:

Whereas, effective provision of library and information services to meet the current and future needs of citizens will be largely dependent upon the availability of competent staff; and

Whereas, the complexities of the information society necessitates a continuing supply of well-educated, quality persons as information professionals; and

Whereas, the rapidly expanding technologies, new techniques for information delivery, and new services to user populations demand library staffs who are continuously expanding their knowledge and abilities to meet new challenges through continuing education and personal development; and

Whereas, the new information society presents challenges which require systematic research efforts which might appropriately be addressed by graduate schools of library and information science; and

Whereas, the Federal Government, through Title II of the Higher Education Act and other Federal legislation, has recognized its responsibility to support education and research for librarianship and information management,

Therefore be it resolved, that continued and intensified efforts be made by the Federal Government to provide direct, designated support to education in library and information sciences, this support to be in forms which will encourage recruitment and instructional improvement, that is, student, faculty and equipment financial assistance, and research and demonstration in both formal and continuing education programs.

Margaret Knox Goggin
Association of American Library Schools

Testimony Submitted by
Robert J. Goodenow

The Microtechnological Revolution and the Necessity to Monitor Its Advancement.

Issues and Position Forces behind the microtechnological revolution include the Apollo Project, the Vietnam War, marketing, and the need to store and retrieve information in an efficient manner. Efficiency and plummeting costs of automation and data communications are direct results of new developments in technology such as charge-coupled devices, bubble memories, fiber-optics, and others.

Electronic mail is in the business world with the power of management work stations that access multiple data banks. Work stations have automated directories, electronic indexing, retrieval, and purging functions. Electronic mail is on its way into the residence. Such capability will be a part of information or computer centers in homes.

The industrial revolution has been succeeded by the microtechnological revolution, with communications paths that permit libraries to manage their information and staff in more effective ways. The computer is more reliable than people; its reliability is supported by: 1) memory capacity and modularity; 2) its own "thought" processes (e.g., logical progressions, calculations); 3) frequency or size of the above; and 4) dependability. Advanced technology permits each datum to be more accessible and controllable by people.

As certain books and paper go away, the new computer picosecond (that displaces today's nanosecond), digitized micrographics, and other developments will cause integrated data bases to be the backbone of the microtechnological revolution. The library will be one segment of this infrastructure. Libraries *and* society must monitor the *timeliness* of each technical development (hardware, firmware, and systems design) so that the:

1) Need to know can be evaluated for appropriate access or privacy. With correct systems design, high technologies will permit more control of accessibility. Cost-effective cryptography permits security never previously envisioned by librarians, engineers, or lay people. For nominal cost today we can incorporate user-to-user encryption with a probability of one chance in 10^{26} of deciphering specific plain text; this high technology privacy makes it almost indecipherable. Today, telecommunications networks are being designed with excellent "fraud prevention" (encryption or access control) for less than $100 per user input-output device.

2) Impact on labor distribution, skill base, and curricula can be understood and projected. Information processing and other technologies are producing a demand for new skills. Labor distribution is shifting so that persons with specialized degrees are performing roles that they were not trained to fulfill. This imbalance

is growing, evidenced by the number of teachers with advanced degrees in education employed as secretaries. Negative impacts (e.g., "technology unemployment") must be foreseen. What happens to the 600,000 letter carriers when electronic mail proliferates? Over one-half million communications workers install and support the conventional analog telephone today. The digital telephone will be as popular as the electronic calculator by the 1990's, and it will be designed as a self-serviceable, disposable item. The largest automobile manufacturer anticipates automating 90 percent of all its production by the mid-1980's.

3) Recognition of industry and information opportunities will permit society to grow. New skill requirements are creating new horizons for education and employment in engineering, science, and business. For projection of which occupations will be opportunities at what time, the following proposal is extended.

Proposal A commission or feasibility panel of library, education, industry, and technology experts should be assembled to ascertain the following: Applicability of an information science index which will provide a tracking mechanism or data base for determining: 1) demand of commercial and institutional skill requirements; 2) curricula needs to meet the above; institutions need the tools, or index, to project and offer appropriate courses and library resources; 3) new hardware, firmware, and software developments with related (e.g., white collar and blue collar) labor displacements; 4) positive technological impacts on creating new and changing institutions and industries; and 5) *timing* of advanced technology displacement of current industries, products, and people.

An information science index will assist in providing a more secure society and lessen the need for a larger welfare state. The index will provide accurate data to develop timely educational, library, and industrial apparatus for needs of our future information society.

Robert J. Goodenow
Advanced Communications Institute
of America, Inc.

Testimony Submitted by Frank M. Graves

Aggregating the Market for Information Systems

by Frank M. Graves

The idea of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services was first formally raised in 1957.[1] In the 20 intervening years, 1958-1978, consider the growth of output of Chemical Abstracts Service of the American Chemical Society:

Activity	1958 Actual	1958 Index	1978 Actual	1978 Index
Abstracts of papers	95,736	100	363,195	379
Abstracts of patents	21,920	100	57,343	262
Abstracts of books	1,274	100	7,804	613
Abstracts total	118,930	100	428,342	360
Journals abstracted	8,377	100	11,804	141
Pages of abstracts	10,628	100	33,368	314
Pages total including indices	15,987	100	83,803	524

SOURCE: Data kindly provided by Jack Allerton, Chemical Abstracts Service, Columbus, Ohio, October 12, 1979.

Thus, the total number of pages has been growing at an annual compound rate of about nine percent. Libraries and information services must somehow cope with this explosion on the supply side of information. They must find ways to improve access to this feast of information for all their users and would-be users. *The main problems are not technical, however, but financial.*[3]

Access can readily be provided by any of the dozen or more communications networks to the hundreds of electronic data bases—but only at a price. The real question is how to pay for this access.

Electronic information technology has a very high front-end fixed cost of hardware and software, and low marginal cost of communications. In this it is like a railroad. The first rail car of freight would have to pay millions of dollars to allow an otherwise empty rail line to recover its full costs. A second car could cut this in half, if both cars shared costs equally; and so on, with average total costs per car dropping rapidly at first, and then more slowly, with each additional unit of demand. Finally, with the rail line operating at perhaps two-thirds of capacity, it would be recovering its full costs at *rates competitive with other modes of transport* such as trucks and barges.

Once the rail line gets this amount of traffic, all additional traffic at that average price generates a very large profit, because the marginal cost of hauling each new unit is so small. The added cost of pulling one more car in a 100-car freight train operating on a railroad that is working close to capacity is minute, compared to the cost of building a railroad and hiring all the employees needed to allow even one car to be hauled.

This reasoning applies exactly to electronic information systems. It is essential that libraries *aggregate the market* to drive down the average cost of service to a point where everybody can afford it.

The influence of market size on production cost has been studied for many years, but the idea of having Federal or other intervention to aggregate markets as a way to facilitate diffusion of expensive technology is quite recent.[3] The spread of such technology can improve our national productivity, among other worthwhile objectives.

At a time when inflation is drastically eroding the purchasing power of library dollars, and budgets are being squeezed further by California Proposition 13 trends, more than simple diligence is needed to find money for information systems. A strategy of aggregating markets to reduce costs and hence prices is required.

The practical steps needed to accomplish this are the following:

1) The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, urged on by the White House Conference, can readily find ways *to secure from vendors of information services and owners of data bases their price schedule for 200, 500, 1,000, 2,000, or more additional subscribers.*

2) The price schedules thus obtained should be very attractive at large volume (many subscribers). *The National Commission should circulate these price lists to the libraries.*

3) *The libraries, meanwhile, should prepare financial plans* incorporating the amount of funds they believe could be raised from local taxes and gifts. A fairly standardized national user fee schedule should be adopted, and it would be reasonable to assume that State legislatures and the Congress would each be willing to put up 25 percent of the information system annual costs for each library—but only if local effort puts up 50 percent.

4) *User fees should be zero during a period of promotion and familiarization* (vouchers might be issued for some number of free queries), *but user fees are valuable at some point to raise needed revenue.* Because "people don't know what they want until they see what they can have,"[4] it is *very* important that there be a free period of promotion and familiarization, to build educated demand.[5]

5) The next step would be for the National Commission to *take the lead in preparing presentations to State and congressional committees* to ask for information system funds based on the quoted prices and affirmed local effort (taxes and user fees).

Obviously a detailed work program and budget for the above market-aggregating activity would be a necessary preliminary element. The National Commission has very recently appointed a new task force, the *Public-Private Sector Task Force,*[6] which would be an excellent group within the Commission to carry the responsibility.

A strategy of merely begging for money will not do; a sound, workable means of lowering costs and demonstrating substantial local effort is the only approach that will work with the State and congressional committees, to obtain adequate supplemental financing for library information systems.

---

[1] *The White House Conference . . ., "Chronology of the White House Conference . . .", no date.*

[2] *The White House Conference . . ., Delegate Information Memorandum No. 1 (31 August 1979) indicates that more than 60 percent of the more than 3,000 resolutions passed at State and Territorial pre-White House Conferences dealt with the need for increased funding for libraries in local communities.*

[3] *See, for example, James M. Utterback, "Innovation and the Diffusion of Technology,"* Science, *vol. 183, no. 4125 (15 February 1974), pages 620-626. This paper is based on research of 1971. The diffusion of technology generally and problems thereof are discussed in Sumner Myers and Eldon E. Sweezy, "Why Innovations Fail,"* Technology Review, *vol. 80, no. 5 (March/April 1978); market difficulties explained 27.5 percent of innovation failures, the largest single factor.*

[4] *Sumner Myers, Institute of Public Administration, Washington, D.C., private communication, 1978.*

[5] *See Cheryl A. Casper, "Pricing Policy for Library Services,"* Journal of the American Society for Information Science, *vol. 30, no. 5 (September 1979), pages 304-309, for a discussion of two user fee alternative objectives: 1) to maximize library revenue; and 2) to maximize user net benefit.*

[6] *Chairman: Robert M. Hayes, Dean, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California at Los Angeles.*

Frank M. Graves

Testimony Submitted by Caroline Grills

Microforms: Microfilm and Microfiche Have Solutions to Information Handling and Linking Problems

I am Caroline Grills, representing the National Micrographics Association as the Association's "official observer."

Microfilm has long been available in libraries as an archival storage convenience—particularly in relation to periodical volumes, rare reference material, books, and dissertations on microfilm.

Today the Federal Government utilizes microforms in nearly every agency. Its use in U.S. Patent data, in Social Security records, military records, and the Government Printing Office, is extensive and vital. Microforms are also meeting some reference needs at the Library of Congress.

Certainly, growing storage and retrieval needs at all libraries mean that we should be looking to microforms to be able to solve some of these problems.

I would like to urge any delegates, as well as all other interested persons, to discover how microforms today mean not only a viable answer to archival storage needs, but to also learn how microforms can be utilized as information capsulized in mylar memory. Microform technology today is a device that easily integrates (or links) with computers, word processors and even satellite communication systems. Microforms as mylar memory can function solely as an information bridge to close the loop, if you will.

Microforms in microfilm or microfiche can also be a valuable tool to bring information to the visually and physically handicapped.

The National Micrographics Association maintains a Resource Center in Silver Spring, Maryland, and is ready to assist you with micrographic information. As the Association's representative and observer at this important Conference, I will be available to answer your questions about microforms, and welcome your inquiries.

Caroline Grills
National Micrographics Association

Testimony Submitted by Marlene Halverson

The Emerging Literature
of Public Interest/Citizen Action Organizations

Contributions of the Public Interest/Citizen Action Movement: The work of public interest/citizen action organizations has been instrumental in improving the quality of life for all citizens in the United States. Their unstinting efforts, for example, have prevented the loss of thousands of lives on our Nation's highways, helped to preserve and protect pristine environments and endangered species, resulted in laws to protect the public health from toxic substances in our environment and unsafe products such as hazardous toys and drugs, and have led to government requirements for truth-in-labeling on our food supply.

The Literature of Public Interest/Citizen Action Organizations: In conjunction with their advocacy, these organizations publish a literature that includes reports, documents, white papers, periodicals, and books and is of great potential value to educators, government officials, technical specialists, and the public at large. Taken together, they represent a growing and provocative agenda of public concerns. "A significant segment of our national journalism, " is how the *Columbia Journalism Review* recently described them. And Ralph Nader has called them "a neglected dimension of adult education and an invitation to civic involvement."

This emerging literature provides news and information which can contribute to effective, citizen-based initiatives, give fresh perspectives on a wide variety of critical public problems, and help to inform policymakers, in and out of government. It covers subjects often not popularly or adequately reported in other media at the time. For example:

1) *Environment* magazine, a publication of the Scientists Institute for Public Information, in November, 1974, first called our attention to the possibility that a chemical pesticide, Phosvel, which was under consideration for registration in the United States, might cause extensive nerve damage in humans and animals. It was two years before the story found its way to the major media and the front page of *The Washington Post.*

2) Long before the Three Mile Island nuclear accident in Pennsylvania, public interest/citizen action group publications, such as *Critical Mass Journal* and reports by the Union of Concerned Scientists, were calling attention to the hazards and diseconomies of nuclear energy.

3) According to a report in the November/December, 1978, *Columbia Journalism Review,* the daily newspapers in Los Angeles (a center of the Proposition 13 tax revolt) weren't doing a very good job of alerting citizens to the full implications for them of its passage. In contrast, Public Citizen's *People & Taxes,* at the time, was not only spelling out the ramifications for the voters of this short-term remedy of their oppressive property tax burdens, but proposing some alternative, long-term solutions, such as cracking down on unjustifiable tax exemptions, weak tax enforcement, loopholes, and widespread corporate evasion of property taxes.

In short, the literature of citizen groups, in many cases, has provided the only early monitoring of serious problems and issues. Ensuring its widespread availability should vastly improve the capability of citizens to govern themselves. Moreover, these publications can help people meet immediate individual needs, as well. For example:

1) *Pension Facts,* an occasional newsletter published by the Pension Rights Center, offers useful information on basic pension rights, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, women and pension systems, and how to read and understand one's pension plan.

2) *Nutrition Action,* published by the Center for Science in the Public Interest, provides information and resources for consumers concerning safe and unsafe chemical additives, school lunch and breakfast programs, nutritional labeling, and the effects of too much salt in the diet.

3) *Network: The Paper for Parents,* published by the National Committee for Citizens in Education, contains guidance for parents who wish to become more involved in their children's schooling.

4) *Golden Page,* published by the National Center on the Black Aged, reports on legislation, consumer matters, nutrition problems, special considerations on growing old, and other matters of particular concern to the Black elderly.

5) *40 Acres and a Mule,* published by the Emergency Land Fund, contains information especially useful to small farmers,

550

particularly to Black farmers, in danger of losing their land, from practical suggestions they can implement themselves to broader social policy reforms to protect and preserve their farmlands and livelihoods.

The distinctive character of these publications is that they not only spotlight problems, but also point out solutions. For example:

1) *Native Self-Sufficiency*, published by the Tribal Sovereignty Project in Guerneville, California, provides Native Americans with technical information and resources for development of self-sufficient economies on tribal reservations.

2) *Alternative Sources of Energy*, published by a group of the same name in Milaca, Minnesota, details individual, self-help projects, from building your own solar hot water heater and wind generator, to wood stove cooking, to building a passive solar home for a northern climate, to making and operating your automobile on methane gas.

3) And, finally, *CoOp: The Harbinger of Economic Democracy*, published by the North American Students of Cooperation in Ann Arbor, Michigan, describes the whole cooperative movement in the United States and provides information on resources and opportunities for cooperatives, including consumer, producer, and worker-owned cooperatives in agriculture, housing, food, credit, insurance, auto repair, electricity, and a range of other areas.

This literature is a distinctive and rich source of alternative ways to solve our national and individual problems and to ensure self-reliance. It is also useful to note that this drive for alternatives has come, in many instances, from the citizens themselves and not from our large institutions and corporations, nor indeed from government. Citizens are identifying their priorities.

Accessibility of Public Interest Group Literature: It is unfortunate, then, that these publications do not yet enjoy wide distribution. For one thing, the limited resources and budgets of the groups which publish them preclude extensive promotional efforts. Since they generally do not include any form of advertising, they cannot use the lucrative advertising revenues to help in their promotion. In addition, they are not generally documented in established readers' indexes or reference systems used by the public. For example, most concerned voters would not have been referred through their community libraries to *People & Taxes*, Volume VI, Numbers 9 and 12, when deciding how to vote on Proposition 13. This past Spring, when there was a run on libraries by citizens, as a result of the nuclear accident at Three Mile Island in Pennsylvania, those wanting information about nuclear energy, again, most likely were not referred to such periodicals as *Not Man Apart*, the Friends of the Earth newspaper which, for the past two years, has carried a section giving up-to-date information on the status, safety, and costs of nuclear power or to *Critical Mass Journal;* or to publications of the Union of Concerned Scientists.

To help remedy this situation, the Commission for the Advancement of Public Interest Organizations recently published a citizen's guide to *Periodicals of Public Interest Organizations*. It is a beginning effort to make this information more accessible to the public. But libraries must cooperate. Heretofore, public libraries have largely ignored these publications. For example, a search of the list of serials carried by the District of Columbia Libraries turned up only a few of the 103 periodicals listed in the Commission's *Guide*.

Position: The publications of public interest organizations are an advocacy literature in the best traditions of our country. They deserve a larger audience as the Nation debates its choices. It is within the purview and mandate of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services to consider the role which libraries and information centers can play in making the public more aware of this unique, civic literature, and giving people ready access to it. To do so is essential for maintaining and deepening our democratic process.

Recommendations: That the Delegates to the Conference recommend a major effort designed:

1) To place this literature in the mainstream of information dissemination in this country; in particular, to include it in the collections of community libraries;

2) To catalog and index for easy reference the issues and topics treated in its pages.

Positive steps that can be taken by the Conference delegates include the following:

1) To propose that information centers and systems, such as established readers' guides to periodical literature and The New York Times Information Bank, add the periodicals of public interest groups to those they regularly monitor for news and information;

2) To include these periodicals in the National Periodicals Center so that all libraries and information centers can access them for library users;

3) To recommend to libraries, particularly community and public libraries, that they carry examples of this literature;

4) To confirm that this literature is referenced in the information systems of the Library of Congress, so that its messages are available to our lawmakers.

It is the Commission's understanding that it will be difficult to enter this literature into the mainstream of the information channels. There is a kind of cycle which perpetuates itself: Libraries do not order new publications unless their readers request them; readers do not request them if they do not know about them; readers do not know about them if they are not referred to them by the readers' guides; and readers' guides do not index them generally unless librarians so request.

The challenge to the White House Conference delegates is to get this information to the public. Breaking this cycle has to start somewhere, and what better place than this, where the mandate and the challenge have been clearly spelled out—to open up the information channels, so that citizens can have access to the full range of information which is available to make effective personal and public choices.

Marlene Halverson
Commission for the Advancement
of Public Interest Organizations

Testimony Submitted by
Joseph R. Hardy

Improving Library and Information Services for Indian Communities

by Dr. Kenneth G. Ross,
Superintendent of Schools, and
Patrick E. Graham, Special Projects Director,
Window Rock School District No. 8
Fort Defiance, Arizona

Anyone familiar with Indian reservations across the country is well aware of the fact that public library and information services basically range from inadequate to nonexistent. Where public libraries do exist, they are very small, usually relegated to an unused storeroom or similar out-of-the-way place, have limited materials available, and are staffed by interested volunteers or dedicated but underpaid workers.

Some areas do receive services from library bookmobiles, but these provide a limited range of materials, often not suited to the existing needs of the populace to be served.

The present situation on Indian reservations is not far different from that in much of rural America. Small pockets of population, great distances, a variety of interests and needs, and limited resources have created major obstacles. On Indian reservations, these obstacles are magnified by the presence of other pressing social, economic, and educational needs, by the lack of coordination between agencies, and by the fact that more traditional library and informational programs require adaptation in order to effectively meet the needs of the multilingual, multicultural environments whose heritage is quite different from that of the European literary tradition.

Libraries—or media centers, as they are coming to be called—and other information services could provide very significant benefits to Indian people of all ages, if they are properly designed, if the people staffing them are appropriately trained and paid as professionals, if the proper range and variety of materials are provided or developed, if there is suitable cooperation of the various agencies involved.

Building libraries would be a step in the right direction, but by itself would benefit only a portion of the Indian people and affect only part of the existing needs. The unique features of Indian heritage and culture pose a special challenge which could be admirably met by the new technology, materials, and techniques available, if appropriate planning is developed and implemented.

A primary emphasis needs to be placed upon the preparation and development of materials in the Indian languages and reflective of the culture and life of the people. In order to effectively provide information to the full range of Indian people, efforts must be initiated, funded, and implemented to provide materials in the various Indian languages and based upon what they need to exist as well as to enrich their lives.

Cost Factors: Any effort to substantially improve the library and information services available inevitably faces the obstacle of funding. We identify five major cost categories: 1) capital outlay—the costs of adequate facilities and equipment; 2) acquisition—the costs of obtaining an adequate range and volume of materials on a continuing basis; 3) development—the costs of providing or creating unique materials designed specifically for the multilingual, multicultural needs of Indian communities; 4) staff—the costs of providing trained staff members to serve the Indian people; and 5) training—initial costs to prepare staff members and to continually provide up-to-date training in new techniques and materials.

It seems apparent that, especially in today's economic atmosphere, adequate funding to even initiate efforts in these categories is not available from any one nor from a combination of sources. However, we feel there are means available to defray some of the more substantial costs involved and to allow for significant expansion of services in the near future.

The Schools: A major area mentioned thus far in this paper is the status of schools on Indian reservations. These schools, whether public, BIA, contract, or private schools are presently, in most cases, a major focal point of activities in the communities they serve. In most instances, they have adequate to above-average libraries, focused in order to serve the educational needs of the students. The significant point is that they have both facilities and trained staff members. It is worth noting also that most schools serving Indian students do not have construction funds, and there would be little overall benefits to Indian people as a whole if the schools wind up competing with libraries for the capital outlay funds desperately needed to improve the facilities available.

There is also the apparent fact that there is presently some overlap or duplication of efforts due to the existence of different, uncoordinated school systems. For example, some communities have public, BIA, and private schools, all with libraries and seldom with any coordination or cooperation between them. Other communities have schools and public libraries with little cooperation.

In the communities of Fort Defiance-Window Rock-St. Michaels, for example, there exist at present four public school libraries, one private school library, a public library, a BIA school library, a museum library, at least three legal libraries, a major tribal research library, and numerous libraries compiled by various tribal, BIA, and other agency offices. All of these involve significant costs, yet each provides a limited range of benefits to the community as a whole.

Window Rock High School has a relatively new library facility which has a comparatively good range of materials. The services and materials available could be expanded to serve the community at large, but the district's funding limitations at present preclude the hiring of the additional staff necessary, and the funds available for materials must be devoted to meeting the needs of students. This is true of all schools.

The point is that facilities do exist which could be utilized to initiate a program to provide a wider range of media services. Trained, experienced staff members, at least in terms of traditional methodology and techniques, are also available in Indian communities. A growing number of Indian persons with advanced training are becoming available due to the programs instituted at a few universities.

The Future: We recommend that a number of sites be identified in various parts of the country to initiate model projects to demonstrate methods of improving library, media, and information services to Indian communities. These locations should be diverse enough to provide an adequate range of models that could be easily adapted to meet the differing needs of Indian communities.

The development of these models would involve the cooperative efforts of the various local agencies and organizations, including tribal councils, as well as the cooperation of State and national agencies and universities.

We are confident that cooperative efforts will do a great deal to overcome the problems encountered by the lack of funds presently available. We feel that such efforts will also result in more efficient use of the funds the various agencies presently have and lead to a wider range of benefits.

Summary: We look forward to the results of the Indian pre-White House Conference and the full White House Conference. We hope that the efforts being initiated will result in real benefits to Indian people and communities. As we have endeavored to indicate in this brief paper, we hope that the participants will look at immediate steps which can be initiated as well as developing long-range plans.

We hope that this paper has provided some ideas which may be beneficial to the participants and may add a small part to the eventual results. We are prepared to cooperate as fully as possible in any efforts to improve the services available to the Indian people and communities.

Joseph R. Hardy

Testimony Submitted by Albert K. Herling

A Bill to Promote the Further Developments of Public Library Services and for Other Purposes

My name is Albert K. Herling. I am an official observer to this White House Conference representing the International Labor Press Association, AFL-CIO/CLC, with headquarters at 815 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. I reside in Greenbelt, Maryland. From 1962 through 1977, I served as a member of the Joint Committee of the American Library Association and the AFL-CIO on Library Services to Labor Groups.

The International Labor Press Association is composed of 640 labor publications, varying from local publications to city and statewide newspapers or magazines, as well as publications of national and international unions. We have a combined circulation of more than 22 million and a readership estimated at 50 million men, women, and young adults.

The proposed legislation, S. 1124, introduced by Senators Javits and Kennedy, has our complete support. This support is a natural continuation of American labor's historic position calling for and backing free public libraries—a position which predates the formation of the American Library Association. In short, American labor has supported the free public library concept for over 100 years.

Today, this proposed National Library Act comes at a most crucial and opportune time. This is a time when library budgets are being ruthlessly cut—as are other necessary public services—on the altar of lower taxes, even as the demand and need for library and information services are on the increase.

We particularly support the concept that the State Advisory Councils on Libraries be "broadly representative . . . of persons using such libraries." We urge that "broad" representation include organized labor on these State Advisory Councils which the proposed legislation calls for.

We are in total agreement with the definition of public library as a library that serves "*free of charge all residents* of a community, district, or region. . . ." We also commend the Bill's definition of public library services as meaning "library services furnished by a public library *free of charge*." Our emphasis is on the word "free," because of the increasing tendency of some public libraries to institute charges for certain services in order to compensate for the disturbing budget cuts. Most ominous is the fact that some political legislative bodies are requiring public libraries to institute these service charges to compensate for the very cuts they themselves instituted.

We would also warn against a tendency on the part of some library systems to reduce the more or less universal character of their collections in order to concentrate on so-called "best sellers" so that they may justify their presence on the basis of huge circulation gains. Such a development subverts and negates the full meaning of public library that we have come to believe in and reduces the library to a modern counterpart of the commercial lending libraries which were so prevalent in my youth in the 1930's. It sets a dangerous precedent which would lead legislators to base future funding of public libraries not on the proper *per capita* basis, but on the basis of circulation figures alone. The sacrifice of the library collections from their universal nature to this limited approach is a betrayal of learning and a betrayal of public trust.

I regret that the time available for this testimony is so necessarily short. There are specific items of labor's interests that we are precluded from bringing to the fore. But our over-riding consideration is to declare our unequivocal support for Senate Bill 1124. We will join all others favoring this legislation in vigorous activity in behalf of its enactment.

I wish to thank you for this opportunity to present this testimony in behalf of the International Labor Press Associatin.

Albert K. Herling
International Labor Press Association

Testimony Submitted by Dale R. Hershey

Library and Information Service in Rural Areas

My comments today will focus on the importance and the unique problems associated with providing information and library services in rural areas. Although I will be specifically addressing the needs and problems of rural Pennsylvania, it is my observation that although they may vary from State to State in degree of severity, the basic needs and problems are similar in rural areas across the Nation. In fact, these problems are essentially the same problems associated with providing any service in rural areas.

The information needs and the problems of meeting these needs are related to and compounded by a number of key social and demographic facts that pertain to rural areas in comparison with urban areas. These social and demographic facts include: 1) low population density; 2) large geographic expanses; 3) lack or sparsity of human service related resources (i.e., professional resources, community service structure, and program monies); 4) negative capital flow to urban areas; 5) erosion of the population and tax bases through past migration of rural residents to urban areas; and 6) the more recent reversal of these migration trends.

Powerful forces, not entirely understood, have long been at work shaping and changing the spatial distribution and character of American society. The massive migration of people from rural areas to cities from World War II to 1970 has been well documented. In these years, millions of workers left traditional rural employment, seeking urban jobs in manufacturing and service industries.

This past erosion of the rural population base, in interaction with the above factors, has created problematic consequences with respect to rural social policy issues, the service needs of rural residents, and the programs directed toward those needs. Although recent migration trends have reversed, these consequences remain with us in rural areas, and in many cases have become more problematic rather than improved with the recent rural population growth. Several major consequences of the historic rural to urban migration flow include: 1) the social cost of space (i.e., low population density coupled with a high degree of geographic dispersion resulted in a higher per-unit cost for rural services than for urban services); 2) a skewed age distribution in rural areas due to the age selectivity of the migration process, resulting in a higher rural dependency ratio and proportionately fewer productive-age people to bear the social and economic costs of human and community services; and 3) due to shrinking tax bases and the increasing flow of agricultural revenues to urban areas, rural areas experienced a failing financial base.

Now, let's look at more recent demographic trends and the resulting impact on providing rural services. Since the 1970 census, rural areas have been showing significant growth, at a rate of 6.6 percent compared to 4.1 percent for urban areas. Rural areas, which in 1970 accounted for 27 percent of the Nation's population, absorbed nearly 37 percent of the 1970-75 population growth and roughly 40 percent of the growth in nonfarm employment that occurred nationally.

While, on the whole, these trends have been perceived as beneficial to rural areas, some areas and some groups have not participated in an equitable way in the growth and development. Geographic dispersion and low population density, skewed age distribution, and limited tax bases continue to be serious problems in providing services in many rural areas. At the same time, some rural communities have encountered serious problems in managing the new population and economic growth. New urban or suburban migrants expect, and often demand, the services to which they had been accustomed, but the tax base hasn't expanded enough to pay for these services.

Many rural people and areas continue to be disadvantaged in terms of wage levels, median family income levels, employment opportunities, adequate housing, access to health care and other essential public facilities and services, and institutional capacity to support local decisionmaking. Rural areas still contain a disproportionate share of the poor, with one-in-six urban residents living in poverty, compared with one-in-nine in rural areas.

While it is not possible to forecast how long or at what rate the population increase in rural America will persist, if the demographic trends of the 1970's should continue through 1985, the net addition to the rural population could easily exceed five million people. By the end of the century, the net addition could amount to well over 15 million.

These demographic trends are especially critical in Pennsylvania. The 1970 census shows the population of Pennsylvania to be 28.5 percent rural. That amounts to about 3.5 million persons, the largest aggregate rural population of any State in the Nation.

The information and library needs of rural Pennsylvanians are particularly desperate. Each year the Bureau of Library Development inventories all public library service areas as part of the process of determining State aid eligibility. The most recent survey shows that 1,359,730 rural Pennsylvanians are either without library service or are inadequately served. That translates to over 11 percent of the State's population having limited access to information services. Low population density, large geographic expanses, lack of human service related resources, and negative capital flow to urban areas all contribute to the difficulty of providing information and library services in rural areas.

There are other complicating factors, however. In the past, and continuing to the present, rural libraries have received meager support at the local, State, and national levels. On a per capita basis, rural libraries are inadequately funded when compared to urban libraries. In a 1978 survey conducted in Pennsylvania, the average per capita expenditure for rural libraries was $3.15. This $3.15 compares to an average of $4.37 for all public libraries in Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh had a per capita average of $6.75; and for Philadelphia it was $7.38. Information services must necessarily be limited when the financial support for rural libraries is so little.

With this low level of financial support, it is not surprising that rural information services are restricted because of the unavailability of professional staff. Rural libraries are forced to rely on volunteers for much of their staffing. Volunteers are important and necessary for any library, but when the basic support staff is comprised of volunteers, information services suffer. The irony is that while greater skill and creativity are required to cope with the limited collections and resources of rural libraries, these same libraries are staffed by untrained librarians.

A third and related problem is restricted information access and flow. Untrained staff are forced to work with limited collections, and while resources may be available through interlibrary loan services and data banks, untrained staff in rural libraries are often not aware of these services. This problem is further complicated by a fact that is often overlooked: even the most basic resources may be inaccessible to a rural library. There are rural libraries that don't even have a telephone. Resource and data banks, no matter how well developed, are just not available to these libraries and their rural service users.

A final but equally important factor is the lack of sponsorship or coordinated spokesmanship at the national level. As in so many of the human and physical services, research, planning, and funding in the area of information services are based on urban needs and problems. The result is low-level funding to rural libraries and methods and technologies that are not applicable to rural areas. Lacking strong national visibility, the needs and problems of rural areas are overlooked.

In conclusion, the following considerations would seem critical in planning for the provision of information and library services in rural areas:

1) That a continued emphasis be placed on meeting the needs of underserved rural areas. Rural libraries cannot meet the challenge of providing services to geographically dispersed populations with the low level of financial support they are currently receiving.

2) Rural libraries require support in providing the basic information and library services that have been applied for years in urban areas. Innovative ideas and technologies must continually be developed, but it must be kept in mind that rural libraries are still seeking many of the basic services.

3) There is a need for ongoing training for the professional and volunteer library staff members in rural libraries. Rural librarians need training not only in basic library science skills, but also in the creative application and utilization of limited collections and resources.

4) There is a need for a national recognition of the importance and the unique problems of providing information and library services in rural communities. The needs of a geographic sector representing one-third of our national population cannot be overlooked.

Dale R. Hershey

Testimony Submitted by Paulette Holahan and A.C. Strip

Federal and State Funding for Public Libraries

A.C. Strip is vice president of the Urban Libraries Council, and Paulette Holahan is treasurer of that organization. The following expresses their personal opinions only.

While the topic we are addressing today is meant to deal with Federal and State funding of public libraries, we perhaps can best open this statement by asserting the conclusion at the outset. The unfortunate conclusion is that the overwhelming majority of all funding for libraries is, at the end of this decade, the same as it was at the beginning of the decade—that is, reliant upon local taxation. Thus, as we begin the decade of the 1980's, the Federal and State funding continues to be a pittance of the funds actually required.

The largest source of Federal library funding, the Library Services and Construction Act, is slightly over $60 million. On a per capita basis, the gross sum expended is just a trifle over 25 cents for each citizen of this country. There are very few programs of any type which are the recipients of Federal funding that are funded on as little a per capita basis as LSCA. In the last eight years of the Library Services and Construction Act, the amount actually appropriated has increased approximately 14 percent for all eight years. We need not review the inflationary spiral that has occurred during those last eight years. Thus, LSCA, in actual spendable dollars, has *decreased* substantially.

At this time, there is a wide divergence of funding by State governments. Many States still make no provision whatever for funding libraries within their State. Still others, which do provide funding, do so to a point where it is hardly more than nominal.

Approximately 80 percent of all of the total of State appropriations comes from less than a dozen States. Many States which do appropriate for library purposes do so on a highly selective basis, and the result is often inequitable and all too often the appropriation does not reach the rural library.

Thus, as we indicated at the beginning, the burden generally falls on the city or county administration to provide for library funding. Worse, that funding often must compete on the ballot with other vital local agencies and is subject to the wrath of an overtaxed local electorate. When the voting plunger is pulled for a five-year library tax or renewal, the weight and yield are essentially fixed for that period of time. In most communities, the real estate property taxes grow by merely one percent per year or, even where the base is healthy and growing, the increase may be but two or three percent per year. Compare this with salary increases of eight percent per year, inflationary increases of 10 to 12 percent per year and fuel increases of up to 30 percent in the last year. Thus, a bookmobile which has suffered an increase in operating expenses of perhaps 25 percent will receive an increase through the property tax of one to two percent.

The responsible business of today would prepare a five-year or seven-year plan and forecast. The library which today prepares a five-year forecast will undoubtedly find itself with an operating deficit based on today's income. In order for that library to live within its means, it must take a step back into yesterday. City governments are hard-pressed to enlarge their expenditures for library services when they are unable to meet the demands for police and fire protection. When that demand is met, there are too many other services for which today's hard-pressed city governments must find funds. Thus the library finds itself fighting for the same funds sought after by boards of education, sanitation departments, capital improvements for city buildings, recreation, and a myriad of other services. The library is left to fend for itself on the same meager budget and too often the same $1 or $2 per capita that it has been receiving for the last half dozen years.

The only alternative which can provide an equitable distribution of funds on a per capita basis is a massive infusion of dollars administered by the Federal Government. Not Federal money, but money flowing *to Washington* for equitable redistribution to library users throughout the country. Only then can there be some reasonable equality among library systems on a per capita basis. That type of funding, supplemented as appropriate by State and local government, would finally achieve some equality among library users. Too often, large metropolitan areas which today survive on $7 per capita, find themselves a mile away from suburban libraries operating on a budget of $25 or $35 per capita.

The flaw in the system is obvious; the direction of the future, using current financing schemes, is at best undesirable. The National Library Act can provide the necessary impetus to permit library systems to step into the 1980's and 1990's properly funded to join the age of electronics, and not step backward into the age of the horse and buggy.

Paulette Holahan and A.C. Strip

Testimony Submitted by Stanley A. Huffman

Technology, Knowledge, and Society

My name is Stanley A. Huffman, Jr., and I am president of the Virginia Educational Media Association, and director, Learning Resource Center, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

A library/resource center may be looked upon as a collection of ideas, in either print or nonprint format, retrievable in an easy manner, so as to have utility by the pursuer of knowledge. To this end, we must move forward to the basic tenants of human learning by using visual and aural resources at our command for information processing. Through the appropriate use of human and technological resources, we can satisfy the need for a literate society and for lifelong learning. The universal concern for learning at all levels must not be preempted.

A primary concern for all people is to advance print, visual, and aural literacy to a comprehension level for achieving an educated society. Printed words offer a broad base of ideas for information processing. Pictures, when visually read, provide a wide range of concepts for interpretation based on previous experiences. Words received aurally are essential in daily communication, but result in lower levels of idea retention. Whether we are providing direct, vicarious, or symbolic experiences through our library/resource centers, it is essential to have a combination of resources to provide a total learning experience.

Today's technological world presents a challenge in decisionmaking relative to the most effective means of supplying information. The concept of immediacy has caused us to seek faster communication systems; however, the need for instant information versus accessibility and cost must be placed in proper perspective. Human ingenuity and creativity have provided technological dimensions in the use of print and nonprint materials for developing an enlightened society. Printing, electronic, visual, and auditory technologies offer a variety of word processing systems. No single information resource medium can resolve the need for knowledge. The challenge becomes one of how to best meet the divergent needs of information-seeking individuals. Inherent in the total process is the development of communication skills necessary to function effectively in an information-dependent society.

The designers of learning experiences, learning systems, and learning materials must take into account the varied interest abilities and needs of individuals so that large numbers of people may be served. As messages are created, it is necessary to explore the medium by which they can best be transmitted. We must examine the reasonable accessibility of a communication system to insure ease of use by the receiver. It may be necessary to create multiple message formats so that communication channels may be selected by the user to accommodate different learning styles and individual differences and preferences. There is no panacea because of the interdependence of all media resources. There is a need for a variety of resources to be accessible from many places as each may be a component in solving man's thirst for knowledge, satisfying his curiosity for things unknown, and bringing the common, as well as esoteric, ideas of inquiry into perspective. Information, resulting from the intellectual curiosity of man, cannot be confined to a single communication system for others to sample. It is essential, in today's world, that print and nonprint information coexist.

Books remain an easily accessible and highly important component for developing educated people. By the same token it is incumbent upon each of us to become more sophisticated in the use of technological resources as a part of the word processing and information system. The cost-effectiveness of any medium may be found in how well it serves an individual's need to know. Thus, if many people use a selected medium, it may be feasible to consider its use on a broad base. To confine all information to a single system may be denying many individuals the opportunity to become knowledgeable about a particular concept. Since library/resource centers must meet a wide range of interests and needs, it is not possible nor practical to stay with or go to one technology system alone. It is mandatory to find a delicate balance of resources easily capable of being accessed, for the fulfillment of individual desires and needs.

Visual and verbal symbols have become languages for universal understanding. Of paramount importance is the development of skills necessary to translate simple and complex facts and concepts from our accepted symbology into a functional manner. As individuals are proactive in message design, thought stimulation, and idea processing, they must also become interactive with available telecommunications technologies for the exchange of information. Also, individuals need to be reactive so as to achieve higher levels of information experience as a result of creative rearrangement of other ideas. Individuals selectively edit in or out bits of information which seem relevant to a given experience. Again, as we perpetuate intellectual curiosity and integrity, no single communication system provides a utopia for man's inquiry; therefore, it is mandatory that both print and nonprint resources become available on a broad base.

During the 1960's, commentary regarding the knowledge and information explosion suggested the need to develop more efficient storage and retrieval capabilities. It was estimated that by the year 2000, we would have 2,000 times as much information available as was known to man by 1960. At the present rate of information processing the estimate may be low. In 1962, the author of this paper talked about the communication revolution of the 1960's and 1970's. During the 1980's, he anticipates a transformation of researched and developed technologies into practical realities for knowledge accessibility to provide individuals with resources to solve problems of intellectual curiosity and needs. In this context, where and how to access the needed resources for problem-solving becomes a problem task within itself.

Research into more basic elements of human learning, analysis of technology's role in information storage, retrieval, and dissemination, and the creation and protection of intellectual property are issues which remain for careful examination in solving library/resource center concerns. There is an overwhelming need to fulfill the public's right to know, as a component of knowledge acquisition and lifelong learning, and to take advantage of the technologies which permit easy creation, transmission, reception, storage, retrieval, and replication of information. Technology is available to change many facets of library/resource centers if we can afford the price tag. The proper use of technology will enhance our understanding of the many complex problems of today's world.

Professional associations, educators at all levels, and lay citizens must work cooperatively to create both the resources and the technological balance necessary to serve the many needs of individuals. From the simple, early caveman symbols to the advanced complex printed and electronic systems so widely used today, the preservation and transmission of a cultural heritage has been a common goal of man as he desires to perpetuate ideas. How symbolism is created, how the appropriate medium is selected for transmission of ideas, and how such resources are made accessible on a broad base is what communication is all about.

Stanley A. Huffman
Virginia Educational Media Association

Testimony Submitted by Linette Hunter

Island Communities of the United States

Please consider the following issues:

Postal Service Rates and Telecommunication Rates: *What*—there are geographical barriers to access to information which should be eliminated, and these particularly affect the noncontiguous areas of the United States; *Why*—the delivery of library books and materials and audiovisual materials by surface mail causes a serious delay in delivery, often resulting in the receipt of information when it is no longer of use. In addition, domestic telecommunication rates do not apply to noncontiguous areas of the United States; *Who*—the policy of the U.S. Postal Service should be changed so that all library materials addressed to noncontiguous areas will be sent as airmail at surface mail rates. Federal policy regarding telecommunication rates should be revised to insure that domestic rates apply to noncontiguous areas of the United States.

Funding Based on Need: What—Federal grants are currently being awarded primarily on a per capita basis and in addition many have matching grant requirements. Areas, such as the noncontiguous areas of the United States, rural areas, etc., which have low population density and low per capita income, are penalized by the existing policy, yet they have the greatest need for information resources; *Why*—in order that all citizens will have access to information they need; *Who*—the National Library Act should include special provisions for funding those areas with special needs.

Diverse Cultural/Ethnic Collections: What—library collections should reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of the Nation's communities, with special emphasis on the indigenous/ethnic populations of a given locality; *Why*—the diverse cultural heritage within the Nation should be recognized. Such a provision in our libraries would promote cultural understanding; *Who*—Congress should mandate a national policy for libraries which should include a provision that all libraries at every level adopt such a collection priority.

Linette Hunter
Island Communities of the United States

Testimony Submitted by Roger F. Jacobs

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Roger F. Jacobs. I am a law librarian, having served in that capacity at the University of Detroit, the University of Windsor-Ontario, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. I am a former member of the Executive Board of the American Association of Law Libraries and a former member of the Boards of Trustees of the Carbondale, Illinois Public Library and the Shawnee, Illinois Library System. I am currently the Librarian of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I come before you this morning to make one simple point which I believe is exceedingly important to the Nation. My point is this: The laws of this country need to be made more accessible to its citizens, and it is altogether appropriate that this Conference clearly and vigorously call attention to this fact.

Every citizen, whether driving down the highway, buying a home or a television set, attending a meeting, cooking a meal, or teaching school is under the control, the regulation, or the jurisdiction of some law. Whether it's a statute of the Federal Congress, an administrative regulation, or a city ordinance, formal laws and regulations are pervasive in today's society. Political philosophers, lawmakers, librarians, and almost anyone who ever considers the point recognize that citizens in a democracy ought to have access to the laws that govern their lives. After all, are not these laws theirs? Are they not expected to have some basic familiarity with the rules of the society in which they live? Or, at the very least, fundamental access to these rules? To merely state the question provides the answer.

And yet, to a large extent, access to legal material has been limited. The public development of collections of books and documents containing the law has largely been left to formal components of the legal profession, the legislative library, the court house library, the law school libraries. With minor exceptions, public libraries have not developed collections which would reveal the law or explicate the legal framework governing a course of action. Professor Dan Henke, an eminent California law librarian, asserts that "few public libraries maintain extensive collections of legal materials, and as library support in many communities is curtailed, this condition may be expected to continue." My own investigation into the results of legislation relating to law libraries indicated that even in those jurisdictions which had the strongest legislation, the libraries were largely in the hands of the professional legal community. Even where legislation specifically demands that the law library be open to the public, it was generally placed within an institution which would have presented formidable barriers to public access. These barriers must be reduced if not eliminated.

The increased education of all of our citizens, the development of law courses in every element of the academic curriculum from junior high school through the university suggests—and I believe it is true—a populace which is competent to read and understand the substance of the basic law books. When faced with a need for this information, the citizen will go to that information source traditionally available to provide continuing education on every subject—the public library. What will the citizen find there? The Nation's laws as expressed in its statutes? In its regulations? In the pronouncements of its Supreme Court? The parallel documents from State or municipality? It is my experience that, in large measure, the public libraries in our communities have not had the human or financial resources to establish these legal collections. Or, if they had them, they were not provided with the staff or training required to offer adequate reader services.

This great Conference provides a singular opportunity to speak out in favor of principles aimed at first recognizing and then remedying this shortfall of resources. Specifically, I would ask this Conference to seriously consider the recommendations of the American Association of Law Libraries: 1) that access to legal information is an individual's right; 2) that the Nation's legal health, like its physical health, needs public support; and 3) the availability of legal information must not be restricted to the libraries of the legal profession.

I urge this Conference to recommend that the Congress and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science investigate and implement appropriate programs which would encourage access to the documents of the law by all citizens—programs which will foster the development of basic legal collections in public libraries and the training of library staff in the use of legal materials. The law belongs to the people. Let us make it available to them in their libraries.

Roger F. Jacobs

Testimony Submitted by
Nancy C. Jacobson

If Public Libraries Are To Survive . . .

Information explosion is a most timely topic. We are told it is the fastest growing industry in the world. Megatons of information abound, much still inaccessible. Historically, libraries through librarians have been the major brokers in the organization and dissemination of knowledge. This role must continue in ever more sophisticated ways to bring order out of chaos for the individual in need of information.

For the general public, the public library has been the vehicle for bringing about this service, which today is taking on broader connotations and is often called "Information and Referral." Adopting this service which will be vital to each and every person living in the 1980's would warrant a change in focus from books to information and, through publicity, should likely produce a by-product called "money," which in the long run might just prove essential to the survival of these same libraries.

Just what is information and referral (I & R for short)? There are as many explanations as there are people who discuss it, but essentially I & R is the process of linking an individual with an information or service need to a resource designed to meet that need. Nearly all libraries already provide the information aspect. Referral indicates an added feature, that of coordinating local community information. The referral aspect can provide the names of people and agencies which provide assistance to those seeking it. This aspect converts the library into a community resource center.

Information service might be as simple as the need for facts about new or used cars (see *Consumer Reports* or the used car guides). Referral might be as complicated as a recent call to our library when a woman asked, "What do I do? My husband just asked me for a divorce." In this case, recommendations might include referral to agencies to cover the emotional aspects (counseling agencies, seminars, support groups), the financial and legal aspects, and/or employment information (such as homemaker re-entry programs). As is obvious, these questions are not in the area of trivia nor are they school assignments. The library can be the first point of communication in some rather momentous decisionmaking.

One of the strongest features of I & R is that it serves everyone, including the physically handicapped, the minorities, the elderly, the poor. It is important to mention here that most libraries have some form of networking which allows interchanges of information so that smaller libraries are able to communicate with larger ones to give individual patrons access to a greater scope of resources.

In order to alert the public to the services already offered in libraries, there is a need to provide massive doses of publicity. The need for more publicity surfaced in various forms in many of the state conferences. Identifying libraries as information centers can bring attention to what libraries are already doing, and this thrust could not only heighten the state of the art, but bring increased revenue, which in turn would assist in further improving the quality of I & R. All of this leads me to the final part of the triumvirate, money, an essential feature along with I & R and public relations.

This service *can* save money from both ends, as an individual user, as a taxpayer, whether it is through information gleaned in order to buy the aforementioned new or used car or whether it's only an "800" telephone number to call a specific agency. In these days of high inflation and tight pocketbooks, the library can be a real source of personal economy.

Public libraries have, particularly in recent years, found themselves competing vigorously, and often futilely, for local funds. Everyone knows of the need for fire and police protection, and everyone is aware of the need for garbage pickup and disposal. The need for information is every bit as important, yet the populace has not yet realized it. If libraries were seen as indispensable, as envisioned by the services already mentioned, they just might be in a better competitive position for the increasingly lower-in-value dollar available for distribution. Considering the very limited budgets, libraries are perhaps the best bargain in government.

One need not be a seer to read the dire message for the future of public library service. Without a major injection of energy, I predict that public library service in the quantity and quality we know it today, limited though it may be, will dwindle into an almost worthless condition. I can describe this in very simple terms: according to a recent Kiplinger report, the Consumer Price Index is expected to rise from 50 to 75 percent in the next five years. The recommendation to businessmen is that they anticipate at least a 60 percent projection. With Proposition 13 in California and a four percent tax cap in Massachusetts, it is incomprehensible that local units of government will willingly and automatically increase library budgets 12 percent a year. And that would mean breaking even with no increase in service no matter what the need.

In summary—

1) Public libraries are indispensable units of government

because

Everyone needs information

and

This includes readers and nonreaders

therefore

Enhancing the reference service by publicizing it as information and including some referral aspects, universal public demand would be created

and

Once the need is recognized, libraries will no longer be at the bottom of the budget heap

because

The need would be acknowledged

then

The increased funding would benefit all other library services as well.

A national campaign publicizing the concept of libraries and information could rejuvenate public libraries and give them the opportunity through a more equitable share of funding to continue current services, improve the Information and Referral aspect, and allow preparation for the future, which so rapidly becomes the present, and even more speedily, the past.

Nancy C. Jacobson

Testimony Submitted by Kamla J. King

I am Kamla King, a law librarian, and I have come to advocate your support of having basic law collections in public libraries. Legal information should be available to everyone, not just to the legal profession. Recognizing this, the American Association of Law Libraries recommended to this Conference that it address the issues involved in making legal information widely available.

In order to implement the recommendations that legal information not be restricted to the libraries of the legal profession nor the use of legal information be a monopoly of the law librarians, I suggest the following. (What I am going to say is based on my previous experience as a law and legislative reference librarian in a State library.)

1) To identify the legal informational needs of the public. Librarians are often in a position to know a community's needs before a book is ever requested. Public librarians have an inherent responsibility to know the government structure of their locality, their State and the Federal government and, further, to know the official legal publications of these entities.

2) My second suggestion involves education. After identifying the legal needs of a community, a librarian must learn how to service these needs. Acquiring law books without also learning how to use them is pointless.

At the Connecticut State Library, the law reference librarians and the Division for Library Development Staff have offered workshops to public librarians in using Connecticut law books.

In the area of education I believe that all of us have a professional responsibility to each other to share our bibliographic expertise. Law librarians can teach public librarians how to do basic legal research and, in turn, can learn from public librarians about general reference sources and data bases which they use.

3) After thinking about the community and the governing bodies under which it exists and learning how the publications of these bodies are used, a librarian will then have a better understanding of what law books should be in the public library. Thus, my third suggestion is to get the books—beg, borrow, or buy them.

Law books are expensive and a law collection must be kept up-to-date. Drawing from my Connecticut experience, I think that the appropriate source of help in acquiring law books is at the State level. In Connecticut, the Secretary of State is required by law (Conn. Gen. Stat. SS 2-61, 1979) to send the State Library 500 copies of the General Statutes and 350 copies of the Session Laws. From this supply, the State Library distributes copies to the public libraries.

This statute is a good beginning. State legislatures could be pressed to make more legal titles available. In States where the legal publications are handled by a private publisher, the State could require in its contract with the publisher that copies be made available for public libraries.

In summary, public librarians need to ask for assistance with legal materials, law librarians need to offer their expertise, and State governments need to recognize an obligation to their citizens. I hope that this White House Conference will serve as a catalyst to bring these three together, and thus make legal information available to everyone.

Kamla J. King

Testimony Submitted by Arnie Klein

The following statement was submitted to the U.S. Conference for an Alternative Media by the Caucus of Concerned Film and Video Librarians, Bard College, New York—June 12-17, 1979.

We, the 400 independent media professionals attending the United States Conference for an Alternative Media, do hereby unanimously endorse all efforts to promote the wider and more effective use of independently produced films and video recordings, as a priority issue within the President's White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

The proven significance of independent cinema and video to educate and inform the citizens of this country makes it imperative that this type of media be recognized as a national resource whose accessibility should be guaranteed to all.

We regard libraries as an efficient means of communicating information and ideas, in the hope of awakening the individual's democratic responsibility to self and community.

Approved by acclamation, June 17th, 1979.

Arnie Klein
U.S. Conference for an Alternative Media

Testimony Submitted by Patricia E. Klinck

My name is Patricia Klinck and I am State Librarian in Vermont, a State with fewer than 500,000 residents and 220 public libraries. I would like to address my testimony to the Javits-Kennedy study bill, S.1124. Although I believe in additional funding for public libraries, I feel S.1124 in its present form is not flexible enough to meet all States' needs and discriminates against small rural States. In its attempt to solve local funding problems, its oversimplified approach is regressive in promoting public library initiative.

Before I get to specifics I must say that the wording in the study bill is ambiguous and the definitions and terms lack specificity and cause confusion. It leads to oversimplification of a complex problem.

I feel that creating a National Library Agency as part of this particular piece of legislation, which deals primarily with public libraries, is similar to creating a National Energy Agency and then giving it responsibility only for "coal." I am opposed to the creation of a National Library Agency if it is to be only another of the many Federal bureaucracies dealing with libraries. If a National Library Agency is to be viable, its first priority should be to coordinate all significant libraries and library agencies at the Federal level, i.e., the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, Agriculture, etc., into a truly national library whose components would constitute the library of last resort for a national library network. The establishment of any national library agency should require special legislation for that purpose only, separate and distinct from any one type of library, with duties and responsibilities clearly delineated. A National Library Agency should not be identified with only one segment of the library community as it continues the fragmentation of library services.

I also wish to address the public library funding formula as proposed in Title II of the Act. Although increases are needed in funding levels for public libraries, I urge that the funding formula ratio proposed in S.1124 be drastically restructured. Federal mandating of State funding levels, and distribution policies which interfere with States' rights and responsibilities, are likely to cause severe funding and policy problems in many State legislatures, possibly leading to a severe decline in library service. For example, in Vermont the formula would force a doubling of State dollars, costing State government an additional three-quarter million dollars. In a time of sky-high and rising energy costs, inflation, tight money, and antitaxation feelings, this is highly unrealistic in a small rural State.

In Vermont, the legislators to date have been extremely negative to this whole new Federal approach to library funding and I would predict severe cutbacks in service as a result. In some States, local control is near and dear to the hearts of the populace. Funding distribution requirements must insure that even though local funding is somewhat relieved, local incentives and responsibilities are not eliminated, that accountability and equity are maintained, that both rural and urban interests are considered. Although many public libraries work hard and get good tax support on the local level, there are just as many who refuse to face the responsibility of doing this. Unique needs, regional differences, and political structures must also be taken into account. Per capita distribution of dollars does not necessarily result in better anything and, in fact, goes against all modern management and public accountability philosophy. Per capita distribution of library funds can discourage incentive and destroy creativity, leading to the "status quo" mentality—waiting for the regular handout.

Again, I think we must beware of an oversimplified approach that only takes into consideration one element of a complex problem.

Patricia E. Klinck

Testimony Submitted by Alex Ladenson

What Is Wrong with the Library Services and Construction Act?

My name is Alex Ladenson, and I am legal counsel to the Urban Libraries Council. Today I would like to address some of my private concerns regarding the Library Services and Construction Act.

The Library Services and Construction Act, enacted in 1964, has been administered as a categorical grant-in-aid program, with the result that the funds were used almost exclusively for research, experimentation, and demonstration. The format for the distribution of funds has remained unchanged through the years, operating in a manner not unlike that of a private foundation. To obtain funds, a public library is required to submit a proposal describing a project. Unless a given project is innovative or experimental, it has little or no chance for approval. Moreover, a project is approved for a relatively short duration and is usually not renewable. If it proves to be successful, the library is compelled to carry on the project with its own funds or abandon it. Thus much of the value to be gained from the project is lost. What is critically needed today, however, are not research, experimental, or demonstration projects. Rather, what is *desperately* needed at this juncture are additional funds for books and other library materials, and for staffing our institutions so that the public can be served.

The Library Services and Construction Act needs to be thoroughly overhauled and cast in a different mold. Instead of providing a categorical grant-in-aid program, it must be converted to a per capita general support program. Federal assistance must be made available to all public libraries, rather than just a small selective number as is the case today.

Public libraries depend largely on the local property tax for their financial support. The property tax is a regressive tax, but its most serious weakness is that it lacks elasticity. Unlike the income tax or sales tax, which generate additional revenue automatically as wages and prices rise, the revenue from the property tax remains relatively constant and increases only very slightly as the total assessed valuation of property rises. This is particularly disastrous in periods of high inflation. It is for this reason that the Federal Government should share with local and State governments the responsibility for direct financial support of public libraries.

Direct Federal assistance to all public libraries is essential in order to equalize disparities in the amount of taxable wealth among the States. Thus, Federal support can help to guarantee the minimum level of funding required to furnish adequate public library service in every State.

We have become a mobile Nation. More than a million persons move from one State to another each year. It is highly desirable, therefore, from a social point of view, that the quality of public library service be equalized among the States, so that an individual is not penalized when he moves from one State to another. The quality of public library service should not be dependent on where a person is born or where he happens to live. Through direct Federal aid, this problem can be alleviated.

The principal objective of Federal aid must be the strengthening of *every* public library in the country, for it is the local library that serves as the first port of entry for those seeking general information or needing to explore a subject in depth. Federal funds should, therefore, be made available for this vital purpose. To achieve this objective, the categorical grant-in-aid design must be discarded and replaced by a more effective instrument, namely, the per capita general support grant.

This is why S.1124, a bill for a National Library Act, should be approved. It incorporates the per capita general support grant in its provisions.

Alex Ladenson

Testimony Submitted by Robert W. Lamson

National Policies for Information and for improving the Policy Process*

Introduction: In considering library and information services for effectively governing our society, there is a need to distinguish between two related subjects, a national policy for information, and a national strategy to improve the policy process. What are the problems, needs and options in each area? How would a national policy for information interact with a national strategy to improve the policy process?

Problem: The Health of the Policy Process and a National Policy For Information: An important question confronts us: How can we address effectively the problems we face, and at the same time, through the policy processes we use, protect and strengthen an important set of political values, e.g. the rule of law, limits on the use and concentration of power, representative democracy, federalism, self-government, freedom, government by the informed consent of the governed, and citizenship—its rights and duties in a free society? A national policy for information and a national strategy to improve the policy process are crucial in addressing this question.

This statement represents only the views of the author.

There are defects in the processes the United States uses to make and implement public policy decisions. These defects threaten our capacity to address effectively the problems we face while enhancing the values listed above. Examples of defects in the policy process include:

- inadequate understanding and agreement by policymakers and citizens about policy issues and options facing the United States,
- fragmented perceptions of problems and of options to cope with them on the part of citizens and policymakers,
- inadequate anticipation of problems,
- inadequate coordination and continuity of effort,
- alienation of many citizens from government,
- low level of voting in elections,
- disintegration of major political parties, and
- insufficiently strong institutions to help citizens fulfill their civic responsibilities, to aggregate individual interests into the public interest, and to increase understanding and agreement about policy issues and options on the part of citizens and policymakers.

Library and information services are relevant to many of these elements and defects in the policy process. This is because information and knowledge help to: 1) determine the distribution of political and economic power in society; 2) shape our perceptions of problems, options, and desirable courses of action; and 3) effect our capacity to address problems effectively, while at the same time we enhance the political values listed above.

Need: A National Strategy: There is a need to develop a national strategy to improve the policy process, including the status of such political concepts as the rule of law, representative democracy, federalism, citizenship, self-government, freedom, and government by informed consent of the governed. A national policy for information could interact strongly with and be part of such a strategy.

Options and Elements of a National Strategy to Improve The Policy Process:

A. *National Dialog, Report and Hearings:* An important element of such a strategy could be an ongoing national dialog concerning the health of the policy process and options to improve it, including relevant aspects of a national policy for information. Out of such an ongoing dialog could emerge the increased understanding and agreement among policymakers and citizens needed to create and implement the strategy.

One important tool in this dialog could be a periodic report and congressional hearings comparable, for example, to reports and hearings used to address policy issues in other areas, such as national security, the economy, and the environment. The report could address the problems inherent in the policy process at all levels and discuss the elements of an effective national strategy to cope with them. In addition to presenting the status and trends of such problems, the report and hearings could discuss options for improvement, needed policies, evaluation, and lessons learned in relevant Federal, State, local, and private sector experience.

B) *Other Elements:* Other possible elements of a national strategy to improve the policy process could include: 1) *needed actions,* such as research and experimentation, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, coordination, creation of a network and information exchange; 2) *means and resources,* such as authority, responsibility, and legislation, funds, personnel, training (education for citizenship), knowledge and information, organization, institutions (including libraries and other organizations), and facilities; and 3) *necessary conditions,* such as leadership, continuity of effort, morale, motivation, and adequate understanding, agreement and support for the strategy by a wide range of policymakers within government and by the citizenry as a whole.

C) *Some Additional Suggestions:* If we are to protect and enhance such political concepts as the rule of law, self-government, and representative democracy, if citizens are to obtain the kinds of information and knowledge they need to manage their own affairs and to fulfill their civic responsibilities, what are the needs for information, processes, and institutions on the part of individual citizens, policymakers, and the public policy process as a whole? What is needed in terms of information (e.g. content and packaging), processes (e.g. dialog), and institutions (e.g. libraries, schools, media, museums)? Some suggested options follow. These options are some possible common elements in a national policy for information and in a national strategy to improve the policy process:

1) *Dialog:* The concept of dialog, involving policymakers and citizens and informed by relevant knowledge, is a key point at which a national policy for information interacts with a national strategy to improve America's capacity for self-government. Dialogs for discussion of policy issues and options can create sufficient understanding and agreement needed to create and implement policies based on self-government and informed consent, instead of some form of manipulation or coercion. National strategies for information and for improving the policy process would need to address the question: What is needed (e.g. research, experimentation, institutional development, etc.) to improve the dialogs through which we address policy issues at all levels?

2) *Neutral Forums for Dialog:* Libraries and other institutions (e.g. schools, media, television, radio, press, museums) can help to provide neutral forums for dialog about policy issues and options. However, we have not yet tried effectively to study, experiment with,

evaluate and improve such dialogs and to communicate the lessons learned.

3) *Packaging of Information—Mapping the Policy Dialog:* It is difficult for the citizen and policymakers, as well as the specialist, to comprehend the status of the debate or dialog on any public policy issue. Since our perceptions of problems and options via the press and television tend to be fragmented in content and over time, it is difficult to grasp what various advocates are saying what about what part of an issue, what are the areas of agreement and disagreement, and how the advocates' positions have changed over time.

An important role for libraries along with other institutions (e.g. research organizations, media, museums, etc.) is not only to provide relevant information and knowledge underlying the dialog, but also to help analyze and display issues and options in ways which citizens and policymakers can more effectively use, including the status of the debate on various policy issues.

Robert W. Lamson

Testimony Submitted by Herbert B. Landau

Madam Chair, fellow delegates, and observers, my name is Herbert B. Landau. I am the president of the American Society for Information Science, an international professional society with over 4,000 members dedicated to the improvement of the information transfer process through research, development, application, and education.

I am also the assistant director for information systems at the Solar Energy Research Institute in Golden, Colorado. The Information Systems Division at SERI, which I direct, has as its purpose the application of information science to solving one of our major national problems—energy.

My job, therefore, as well as my professional society offiliation is directly tied to the charge which I now present to you on behalf of ASIS.

ASIS' statement of issues is predicated upon certain basic assumptions regarding national information activities:

- Our goal is to facilitate the transfer of information from the source to the users to solve their problems; and to deliver this information to the users when and where they need it.

- Information delivery structures and packages should follow need.

- Information funding (at all levels) should also follow need.

ASIS has developed a statement of eight basic issues to be addressed by this Conference. Since I am requesting that the text of these issues be incorporated into the official transcript, I will cite just the title of each issue at this time:

1) Information as a National Resource

2) Need for a National Information Policy

3) Application of Technology to Improvement of Library and Information Services

4) Information for the Citizen at the Local Level

5) Public Private Interface

6) The Cost of Access to Information

7) International Activities

8) Research for Information Science.

ADDENDUM:

Issues to be Considered by the
White House Conference on Library and Information Services
as Proposed by the
American Society for Information Science (ASIS)

ASIS, as a leading professional society in the information community, has been concerned with issues to be addressed at the forthcoming White House Conference on Library and Information Services. The ASIS Council has developed the issue statements listed below. In developing these issues, ASIS felt that any deliberations of—and any resulting outcomes from—the White House Conference must be considered in the proper perspective. The Conference, as suggested by its name, is organized to address both Library Services and Information Services. The structure of five basic themes for the Conference enforces that organization. In the course of your deliberations we hope that you have the opportunity to consider the issues we briefly cite here.

1) *Information as a National Resource:* Information is an essential basis for the survival and well-being of the individual, the community, and the nation. "Information" in the sense of a national resource goes beyond the data in people's minds and in the records of people's thoughts as found in files, in libraries, in archives and museums, and in electronic storage. It includes the material and human resources devoted to the production, collection, storage, retrieval, and use of those data. As a nation, we have devoted enormous resources to information, as reflected by the growing proportion of our national product devoted to information activities. These resources need to be more effectively used in the improvement of our citizens' lives and of our nation's stature in the international community.

2) *Need for a National Information Policy:* Despite great diversity and creativeness shown in the development of information resources in this country, there is an enormous gap between the resources and their application to the needs of the people and of society as a whole. The reason lies in part in the lack of a shared understanding among the users of these resources, and even among the information providers, as to what is needed, what is possible, and what is desirable by way of priorities. As a nation, we need to develop such a consensus, in the form of a national policy for the development and use of information resources. It should be a living document, drawing from the widest range of sources, and changing to reflect the development and refinement of the consensus.

3) *Application of Technology to Improvement of Library and Information Services:* Information technology has developed far faster than we as a society have been able to apply it appropriately. There are undesirable redundancies in some applications, and woeful lack of availability of technology in other areas, some of them of great human urgency. One of the purposes of a consciously defined national policy should be to develop a consensus about the priorities of need, and to direct available technology to needs of great importance that are now poorly served. An important part of technology utilization is the need for better and more sensitive means by which to identify and assess user needs, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the systems in serving those needs.

4) *Information for the Citizen at the Local Level:* Just as we have learned that massive funding does not solve other problems of society, massive information systems by themselves do not assure that the people can assess the useful information they need when they need it. Until information generated at the federal level is focused to the potential user it will not be used to any significant degree for solving societal problems.

5) *Public-Private Interface:* There is a lack of understanding with respect to the proper role of the public and private sectors in the production and dissemination of scientific, technical, business, and other information to meet the information needs of the nation. By private is meant commercial, profit-seeking, and certain non-government organizations such as professional societies and universities. Unproductive competition and friction between the public and private sectors will continue in the absence of a policy to which both communities subscribe.

6) *The Cost of Access to Information:* The information community is faced with a dilemma. How can we assure that the citizen is not denied access to information while ensuring that those who underwrite the costs of this information are adequately compensated for their efforts?

7) *International Activities:* With modern telecommunications systems, the increasing availability of machine-readable services, and expanded international cooperative programs, the U.S. information community must look beyond the borders of the country, and

consider information from a broader, international perspective. U.S. participation in international activities must keep pace with developments, and the United States should take a leadership role in them, to assure continued international exchange of information.

8) *Research for Information Science:* In research efforts we need to think about "information" as a concept whose generality transcends that of communications, engineering, librarianship, etc. Information exists for a purpose; it always supports another system. It should be the subject of interdisciplinary investigation. Examples where research will continue to be required, at both basic and applied levels, are:

a) for systems to solve source problems

b) to locate and combine information from many sources—science and technology, humanities, law, economics, etc.

c) on the linkage of information, data processing, and communication

d) the behavioral aspects of information processing and use—the emphasis must center on the human side of information

e) the use and influence of new media and impact of technology.

Herbert B. Landau
American Society for Information Science

Testimony Submitted by Elizabeth N. Layne

I am Elizabeth N. Layne. I live in New York City and make my living as a freelance researcher. My livelihood depends on access to public libraries. Because of my interest in these institutions, I am enrolled as a student in the Library School of Rutgers University. I am also co-author of the book *For the People, Fighting for Public Libraries*.

For me, the most exciting aspect of the present challenges facing America's public libraries is in serving the independent adult learner. Let me tell you why.

Potentially, the most revolutionary change in higher education within the last few years, and one offering the greatest challenge to public librarians, has been the growth in so-called nontraditional education. At least a hundred accredited institutions of higher learning offer different programs for such learners, and these and similar programs are increasing each year.

Although nontraditional education takes many forms, the emphasis is on nonclassroom study and independent learning. Programs are geared to working adults who frequently cannot find the time or money to pursue traditional classroom instruction. Most provide little or no teacher contact, little or no library facilities. The student's primary day-to-day help is likely to come from his public librarian. Nontraditional programs leading toward recognized academic accreditation include:

1) *Proficiency examinations:* These allow students to earn full-course credit by examination without attending class. One of the best known is the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) initiated by the College Entrance Examination Board in the mid-1960's. CLEP tests are offered in more than 50 college subjects for which credit may be received at some 1,800 participating colleges and universities. Since 1971, over a million CLEP tests have been taken. It does not matter where, when, or how the student learned the subject matter, if the results of his test are acceptable to his college, he receives credit. Some institutions allow as many as 60 credits to be earned through proficiency examination. CLEP offers no preparation guidance to students.

2) *External degrees:* Over 100 colleges and universities in 39 States offer recognized external degrees designed to serve those who are, for whatever reason, unable to attend institutions of higher learning. Some colleges, such as Empire State in New York and Thomas A. Edison in New Jersey, have no faculty, no classrooms, and no libraries. Credits are often earned by a combination of means—proficiency examinations, televised instruction, regular courses, life experience that can be shown to be the equivalent of a college-level competence in a given area, noncollegiate sponsored instruction given by private companies, such as Eastman Kodak or General Electric.

3) *Correspondence courses:* More than 50 member colleges and universities of the National University Extension Association offer correspondence courses, ranging from accounting to writing, for which undergraduate credit is given; and seven institutions offer graduate credit by correspondence. These courses are designed for those who either want to or must study at home and prefer to work at their own pace.

The emphasis on self-preparation in all forms of nontraditional study means that library use by these students is bound to be far greater than that of traditional students. And the fact that these students live off campus obviously means that primary reliance will be on the community public library.

The Commission on Non-Traditional Study, a group of 26 educators headed by Samuel B. Gould, was formed in 1971 by the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service to examine the entire range of nontraditional study and to formulate specific recommendations for the future guidance of nontraditional education. In its 1973 report, entitled *Diversity by Design,* the Commission recommended, "the public library should be strengthened to become a far more powerful instrument for nontraditional education than is now the case." The Commission urged college and university faculty members and administrators to work with public librarians in developing nontraditional study opportunities at the postsecondary level, pointing out that the public library's "vast capabilities have often been ignored."

Servicing the need of the individual user has always been a primary function of the public library. As an aid to those looking for courses in a particular field or attempting to choose a college or university, public libraries have traditionally given shelf space to school catalogues and directories. Today that is not enough. The spectacular growth in adult education and the great diversity of programs that have sprung up around the country within the past decade—many of them programs designed to give mature adults an opportunity to acquire academic credentials outside traditional forms of higher education—mean that potential students are very much in need of guidance from a neutral source in their communities.

Many of the anxieties of the prospective nontraditional student can be allayed by simply being told the facts. Many adults worry about the consequences of having failed a freshman course 10 years before, or having attended a nonacademic high school, or not having graduated from high school at all. Librarians who serve as educational advisers can reassure such individuals that none of these things matter.

Numerous studies have shown that there are literally millions of people who would like to continue their education but have no idea of the opportunities available to them. In response to this need, public libraries are expanding their activities to provide learner's advisory services. As the Commission on Non-Traditional Learning points out, "the public library is probably the best community agency to house, staff, and maintain a full guidance and counselling center."

One of the newest programs is the experimental Higher Educational Library Advisory Service (HELAS) being offered at four libraries in New York State in conjunction with the New York State Board of Regents because, explains Pat Dyer, Board of Regents director of the project, "the public library is truly the all-round educational center for adults, particularly the person who wants to explore a number of educational options." Under this program, librarians are specially trained to give information on all types of postsecondary education options available in the community, to help individuals in making decisions related to their educational goals, and to refer people to appropriate institutions.

HELAS librarians are also seeing many clients who are using the library for the first time. The Queens Borough (New York) Public Library HELAS program has attracted many minority group members, including recent immigrants from Jamaica and Haiti. One of the library's most impressive student users is a Haitian mother of five children who holds down a full-time job while earning her required credits for a degree in nursing through the Board of Regent's External Degree examinations. "She has been taking a minimum of two exams every three months," explains Kay Cavanaugh, the HELAS librarian who works with her, "and she has been passing them with flying colors."

In the early 1970's, special emphasis was given to learners' advisory services in a number of public libraries across the country—Atlanta, Denver, Baltimore, Miami, Portland (Maine), Salt Lake City, St. Louis, Tulsa, and Woodbridge (New Jersey). Special library programs offered in-depth advisory and information-support services to adults interested in learning outside of a formal educational setting. The chief element that distinguished the independent learner project from traditionally offered services was the extended staff involvement with the individual learner throughout his learning project. "People often need help in deciding exactly what it is they want to learn," explains Edwin Beckerman, director of the Woodbridge Public Library, "and they need help in clarifying their ambitions. This is the job of the learning advisers."

Adult learner services should be made available in all public libraries. The best way to do this is through a new National Library Act, which should be funded promptly.

Elizabeth N. Layne

Testimony Submitted by John A. Malloy

Saving—Serving—Selling

Pi Beta Alpha came to be on August 8, 1947, in the State of Ohio "for persons concerned with books and/or other educational materials." It is a professional and honorary association made up of regional and State chapters, with a national membership of approximately 900 salespersons. Qualifications for membership meet all requirements of national, State, and local legislatures. In addition, our by-laws demand that all nominees meet our professional and personal standards and our values of experience in the field. For this Conference, we represent 18 educational sales organizations, approximately 2,100 salespersons.

To the Conference leadership, we endorse wholeheartedly your decisions: 1) that two-thirds of the delegates here present be users of libraries and information services; and 2) your international approach. To the delegates thus selected, we offer our warmest congratulations. Your having been invited is a tribute to the merit of your credentials. We applaud your coming, and thank you for your contributions. We promise to do whatever we can to fill your needs.

To you librarians and information-providing personnel, we are deeply indebted. The ideas being shared (conceived over the 16 years of working in the field of education) have been triggered by you. You take the time to listen, judge what is being offered, apply your own mental distillation, and then give us the full benefit of your personal storehouse of education, experience, and expertise. With each of our thoughts, we will offer our suggestions. We sincerely ask that you reply with your comments and amendments. We assure you that each will be acknowledged. Please accept our sincere appreciation.

We offer this formula: "A Dollar Exchanged—Each has ONE Dollar; An Idea Exchanged—Each has TWO Ideas." Let's swap some ideas.

Saving: We must cut costs. We can cut costs. To anyone who is sincerely interested in making the best use of every penny spent, we offer as the prime target: *Reduce the cost of samples.* Certified data proves that sampling adds four percent to six percent to print material production costs. On nonprint, the burden goes to 6.5 percent to eight percent. Please note these are the *plant costs.* Selling price accounting varies. However, we can be certain that effective sampling techniques could reduce the selling price by 15 percent to 10 percent.

We stand ready to sit down with you and review your present methods. We ask that, if you should want such a meeting; 1) send us a short outline of your present procedures; 2) include your timing schedule; and 3) tell us how many of your people will be in attendance. We are sure you realize our need of your data. Confine it to the basics, please. It is our idea that if six libraries, and/or school districts, feel the merit of examining a certain book or series, and we can set a central examining location at the time of a regional, State, or national meeting, each participant will reap the greatest benefit.

Serving: Serving is a must for any salesperson. It is especially true of the educational sales fraternity. We fully realize, and are very grateful for the opportunities created for us by those we serve. We believe we are wasting a very valuable asset. Across the country, every city, town, and in fact every school area has a storehouse of experience sitting by the wayside. We refer to those senior citizens—retired librarians, teachers, and sales personnel. Our cautious inquiries have been most fruitful. Most of them are eager to serve. Some, whose retirement plans are being eroded by inflation, could well use some additional income. It is our idea that they could be used at book fairs; regional, county, State, and national meetings—wherever product exhibits require part-time help. Not all of them would be as pretty as Kelly Girls, but we feel sure that they would make a better presentation of your products.

Selling: We can almost hear you saying, "Now, comes the sales pitch!" You are right. The Library Services Act of 1965, heaven bless President Lyndon Johnson, started the dollars flowing. The next 10 to 12 years brought more and more dollars to more and more areas of education. That same period also brought the undesirables who masqueraded as "salespersons." Educational sales compensation plans vary widely. During the easy money years, these undesirables were able to get in and get the fast buck. Since 1978, as competition intensified, we have been able to weed them out. If you have been "taken" by any of these sharpshooters, we invite you to use your Chamber of Commerce, Better Business Bureau, or write us directly.

Our mutual best interests demand that we eliminate them. Our idea: We believe that this is the area in which we have the best chance to "swap an idea." Please tell us whether or not you agree.

Thank you for reading down to this point. We know that you will realize that we were given much help in many ways, with many minutes, by many people. To each please accept our grateful acknowledgement.

John A. Malloy
Pi Beta Alpha

Testimony Submitted by Cheryl Marshall

My name is Cheryl Marshall. I live in New Jersey and am on the Montclair Public Library staff. I have had a unique opportunity to study the role of information and referral services for the poor and disadvantaged through an experimental program in our own library.

In 1975, there were 25.9 million Americans—12 percent of the population—living below the subsistence income poverty level as determined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The majority of these poor are either Black, of Spanish origin, elderly, or in families headed by women. Those below the poverty level in 1974 (the most recent available figures) accounted for 10 percent of the white population, 31 percent of the Black population, and 27 percent of the Spanish origin population. Most of the poor lived in metropolitan areas and 36 percent were inner-city residents.

More than 23 million adult Americans—one in five—lack even the rudimentary skills to cope in our society. They are unable to fill out job applications, write checks, address envelopes, dial a telephone, read a bus or traffic sign, follow instructions on a paint can, calculate take-home pay, or understand help-wanted ads.

The functionally incompetent tend to be older, undereducated, unskilled, unemployed, and living in poverty—16 percent of the white population are in this category; 44 percent of the Black population; and 56 percent of those with Spanish surnames.

Libraries have a dramatic potential for helping the disadvantaged in our society not only to survive but also to achieve a richer, fuller life. They can help by sharpening reading skills. They can help by supplying specific information. They can help by providing links with one's cultural heritage. The difficult question is: How do you make library services available to people who do not have the motivation and characteristics of conventional library users? How do you reach people who, if they think about their community library at all, view it as an alien and fearful world, a world which may perhaps be accessible to their children in school, but certainly not to them?

Librarians are increasingly overcoming the cultural and language barriers that prevent members of minority groups from using the library services to which they are entitled. In New York City's South Bronx, where 200,000 Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking people are concentrated, the key to effective service has been the use of a community liaison assistant, a Spanish-speaking nonlibrarian who serves as a strong connecting link between the neighborhood and each of the nine branch libraries serving the area. The South Bronx is synonymous in the minds of many New Yorkers with the most degrading living conditions in the city—blocks of vacant, burned-out buildings; many of the occupied buildings without running water; 40 percent of the residents on welfare; 30 percent of the employable unemployed. The community liaison assistant works directly with schools, churches, poverty agencies, community centers, and political and social clubs. In this way the community is informed about free library services, books, and materials and is encouraged to come into the library. Each branch library has a Spanish-speaking staff member to help the individual library user in either Spanish or English. Materials in both Spanish and English concentrate on practical needs, including vocational and adult education. Emphasis on the historical and cultural heritage of the Spanish-speaking people is strong. When people started coming into the libraries in the South Bronx in response to this program, the majority of their inquiries had to do with survival:

"Can you help me write a letter for food stamps for my grandmother and me?"

"My little girl, she can't read 'cause she doesn't see too good. Do you have glasses?"

Information and Referral Services: Banner posters plastered on the sides of public buses in the city of Memphis ask in bright red letters against a yellow background: "NEED HELP? NEED INFORMATION? CALL *LINC,* 528-2999." The number is that of the Memphis Public Library's Information Center.

In Detroit, the number to call is 833-4000, or any one of the Detroit Public Library's 26 branches. Information and referral services are fairly new to the public library landscape, but they are rapidly becoming a standard service in every region of the United States—from Montclair, New Jersey, to Wake County, North Carolina, to Chicago (where Spanish-speaking librarians answer calls on a special line), to Houston, Texas. Their purpose: to link up an individual with the service, activity, information, or advice that fits his need.

The Detroit TIP program (The Information Place), which began in 1973, is the first and one of the best information and referral centers. TIP keeps track of some 1,500 organizations—any type that provides some kind of service to the public from health, education, and welfare services to chess clubs and cooking classes. For each agency, there are perhaps 10 separate headings directing the inquirer to that service, thereby providing roughly 15,000 information entries to needed services. Information is constantly updated, both at the central library and at the branches. The program receives from 5,000 to 8,000 telephone requests a month, plus a couple of thousand in-person queries from people who come to the library itself. The TIP service is available seven days a week.

TIP can tell inquirers where to get a senior citizen bus card, where to get a cancer checkup, where to learn a trade. People calling for information about nursing homes can be put in touch with an organization called Citizens for Better Care, a group familiar with nursing home care in the area; people with landlord-tenant problems may be referred to the Small Claims Court or a legal aid service that will help them specifically with a landlord-tenant dispute. A low-income mother who worries there is something wrong with her child's diet, or who calls because she has heard about "some place" where she can get special food for her baby, is directed to a supplemental food program run by the Detroit Department of Health for pregnant or breast-feeding women, and for children under four years of age. TIP gets a lot of phone calls from people who want to go back to secondary school but don't know how to go about it. They are told where they may go for preparatory classes for a high school equivalency examination.

TIP librarians take time to give inquirers enough information so that they can deal with the situation for themselves. TIP also follows up on many of its referrals. A man in need of medical care, who had been refused service by his doctor when he discovered that his patient was no longer covered by medical insurance, recently called TIP for help. The librarian referred the caller to Detroit General Hospital for free medical treatment and smoothed the way at the clinic by calling and making an appointment for him. The caller was upset at having to take "charity" for the first time in his life. The librarian explained to him that as a taxpayer he was entitled to free medical service. The librarian took the man's name and phone number and later followed up to see how the hospital referral worked out.

A Black woman on public assistance with four children called TIP in utter frustration. She needed to go into the hospital for an operation, but because she had no proof that she was covered by Medicaid, the hospital would not admit her. Although she was indeed covered, her social worker, harried and overworked, was not taking steps to help her. Phone calls by the librarian to the community affairs office of the Michigan Department of Social Services and to the hospital straightened out the matter. It was simply a question of someone interceding for the woman and verbalizing her need. A librarian filled the bill.

By indexing their community's social and recreational services, the public library gains a unique overview of community facilities. This has allowed the library in some instances to help bring about needed change.

In Memphis, for example, it became evident to the referral service librarians that there existed no free burial service of any kind for city residents, not even a "potter's field," and that this worked considerable hardship for poor families. Through neighborhood contacts which the branch librarians had already established in the course of their "community walks," the librarians were able to make arrangements with funeral directors in the disadvantaged areas for free funeral services and burial plots in cases referred to them by social workers from the Memphis Department of Human Services. Also, in Memphis, a program suggested by the library's information and referral service has helped to coordinate the giving of Christmas toys and food baskets to poor families by church and social groups.

Ironically, such information services in public libraries have proved so effective that as many as 50 percent of the inquiries come from public agencies seeking information about services provided by other agencies—an unanticipated result which dramatizes the void that exists in centralized information sources.

A variety of techniques must be utilized to uncover a full knowledge of community resources. Through churches, Lions clubs, the Black Knights of Mallory, and even bars and barbershops, many public libraries have become part of an informal community network. In one case, the only effective way a public library could provide information and referral services to a strongly religious Eastern European neighborhood was for the librarians to arrange for neighborhood priests to act as intermediaries. The priests called the library for the necessary information, which they then relayed to their parishioners.

Although the prime target of these new community information and referral services is the disadvantaged, the services do not stop there. Many people from all income levels make use of these public library services to help them grapple with the complex problems which face all citizens in an increasingly regulated society.

These experiments have taught us that there is a crucial new role that needs to be filled in our society, and the ideal way to fill that role is through our public libraries. But we cannot continue to do so on a patchwork hit-or-miss basis. We need a new National Library Act to provide funding and coordination. And we need to get it funded and in operation as soon as possible.

Cheryl Marshall

Testimony Submitted by Cheryl Metoyer-Duran

I am Cheryl Metoyer-Duran, Cherokee Indian, the library delegate from the pre-White House Conference on Indian Library and Information Services on or near reservations. I have worked with numerous library projects, on and off reservations, and have directed the National Indian Education Association's Indian Library Services Technical Association Center (ILSTAC). I am currently an Assistant Professor in the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of California at Los Angeles. I am continuing a research project, the purpose of which is to develop a descriptive data base related to library development for Indian people—reservation and urban.

Throughout the years, the information needs of American Indian reservation communities have been rarely recognized, and even less frequently addressed. Yet, wampum belts, memory sticks (treaties, songs, plant names, habits, and use of animals), and paintings on skin have been the traditional means by which Indian people have recorded, preserved, and disseminated information for their communities. Hence, information storage and retrieval, contrary to popular belief, are *not* new concepts to Indian people. What may appear unusual to Indian people is the traditional Anglo concept of a library and the appearance of a library facility.

The current status of library and information services to American Indian people can be characterized by the following five conditions: 1) lack of understanding and/or documentation of the information needs of American Indian people; 2) inappropriate or inadequate materials to meet these needs; 3) inability or unwillingness of public libraries in urban areas with Indian populations to effectively respond to these needs; 4) the lack of library facilities and services on Indian reservations; and 5) the lack of sufficient numbers of American Indian librarians to staff Indian libraries.

To illustrate this final point, I cannot at present identify, with absolute certainty, one Indian librarian with an MLS degree working full-time in a reservation library.

While there are numerous and diverse pieces of legislation enumerating Indian education, there still does not exist a single Act specifying dollars for Indian libraries on reservations. This situation cannot endure.

Legislation related specifically to the education of American Indian people *makes possible* the strengthening of the link between education and information for American Indian people. Indeed, the purpose of the *Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act* is as follows: "To provide maximum Indian participation in the government and education of Indian people; to provide for the full participation of Indian tribes in programs and services conducted by the Federal Government for Indians and to encourage the development of human resources of the Indian people; to establish programs of assistance to upgrade Indian education; to support the right of Indian citizens to control their own education activities; and for other purposes." (*Indian Self-Determination & Education Assistance Act*, 1975, p. 1). The development of libraries as an element in the educational progress of Indian people is implied in the educational goals specified by this act.

A handful of librarians and a few other Indian educators have been urging and prodding for Indian library and information services. Now with the increasing complexity of Indian life, urban and reservation, due to land rights and mineral rights disputes, the list of information-concerned persons is ever *growing;* tribal chairmen see information as an invaluable commodity for the effective governance of their tribes; economic and legal planners are increasingly outraged at the need for trips to Washington, D.C., for information which should be readily available locally via computer systems; reservation medical personnel have come to realize the potential of immediate medical information assistance via links with Medlars; and finally, the local community member, who simply wants to know where he can register a consumer complaint, is turning to the library for the answer.

American Indian people, then, have demonstrated their desire and need for responsive information service. It is fitting and appropriate that careful assessment, planning, implementation, and cooperation with other information agencies will enable the local reservation library to provide its community with the proper information, at the proper time, and in the appropriate format. I envision a system of community based and controlled libraries, cooperating with public and state libraries and plugging into national data bases. Such a network would serve as a direct expression of the Indian values of sharing and cooperation in the quest for the knowledge and information required in today's society.

You can enable the strong and continuing support for Indian library development by doing the following: work with us to pass the legislation that will provide the fiscal resources for Indian library development. Indian tribes, organizations, and agencies should be able to directly apply for and receive these funds without unnecessary and unwarranted intervention.

Indian people have demonstrated their need and desire for information services. We mean to have these services.

Cheryl Metoyer-Duran

Testimony Submitted by Frank C. Mevers

Statement that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services will endorse the needs and approaches for the arrangement and preservation of archival materials as currently provided in the programs of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Society of American Archivists.

Frank C. Mevers
State Archivist
New Hampshire

Testimony Submitted by Sophie Mitrisin

Private Libraries: A neglected service and a neglected resource

My name is Sophie Mitrisin, and I earn my living by working in a library. Since I work alone, I do everything that has to be done in a library, and I have no wish to increase my responsibilities nor my duties.

A composite statement from two library texts both dated 1950 reads: "Librarianship is a calling that devotes itself to bringing books into the common life of the world. Through guidance and stimulation of reading, librarianship aims to promote an enlightened citizenship and enriched personal lives. To bulwark and extend individual reading there must be individual possession of books. Ownership of books has unending implications and possibilities. It may reveal unsuspected tastes, or stimulate unrealized capabilities. It will surely deepen and stabilize in any household the intangible elements of culture. Books are the most interesting and distinguished accessories of any home. They give a home character and meaning."

This eloquent statement addresses the potentials of book ownership. It is not the purpose of this presentation to suggest even remotely that librarians and libraries should engage in selling books or engage in other commercial enterprises dealing with the development of personal libraries. Libraries are defined as places for the retention of books to be used for study or reading, not for sale.

If librarians have neglected to encourage the individual possession of books, the neglect can be regarded as indigenous to the nature of librarianship. Book ownership involves a substantial exchange of money for customers persuaded to spend some of their money on books and the equipment to house and maintain them. Librarians see their monetary decisions as being confined to the needs of the collection under their care, a collection maintained for use, not for sale; to provide the needs of readers, scholars, students, borrowers, or patrons. They do not recognize customers or purchasers or even clients as being descriptive of the public calling upon their services.

Librarians are notoriously uneasy in the exchange of money between themselves and their patrons. They recognize the usefulness of money. They know its negative aspects, as a punitive measure such as fines to discourage the misuse of library property and the infringement of library rules. They know its usefulness as an exclusionary measure in the form of registration fees to limit library use. While librarians are well aware of the costs involved in the maintenance of even a modest library collection, they are not equipped by inclination or definition to move easily in the business of book selling. They see themselves as being required to provide a maximum of service at a minimum of outlay of public money. They find it uncongenial to talk realistically to their patrons about the cost of maintaining a personal library.

Librarians have directed their efforts toward the stimulation of reading, the pleasure of reading, the benefits of reading, even the necessity of reading. It is to be expected that people who buy books read them. Book readers are reported to be an affluent, well-educated group who like to loiter in book shops. There are those practical people who buy a book, go home and read it the same night, and place it on their shelf where it fills up space; there are other less realistic accumulators who put a newly bought book on their shelf where it must wait two or three years to be read. In either case, 20 or 30 years of book buying and reading is apt to result in an impressive accumulation of books with implications and possibilities as a resource to the geographic and intellectual community.

Separate from the problem of reading and absorbing the information and knowledge that a collection of this kind represents, the owner has had to deal with the difficulties of selection, acquisition, arrangement, organization, the possibilities of insurance costs, tax deductions, the disposal periodically of access materials, and the eventual disposition of a personal collection. These problems are inevitably going to increase in complexity as the reading environment becomes more complex with the increasing use of electronic and mechanical devices to supplement traditional hard copy. It is reasonable to wonder what the content and makeup of a personal library will be in the not too distant future.

Librarians who maintain a collection as a public service know that a library is expensive and troublesome. The professional librarian can look for assistance to other librarians, to manufacturers of library supplies, to the book trade. For the individual book accumulator, there is no such recognized group to offer or provide assistance. The library literature that exists is written for the working librarian who is engaged in providing library services on a daily basis. The instruction manuals that are written for the purpose do not translate easily to meet the needs of the individual book owner maintaining a private library. It is an area of knowledge uniquely the domain of the library profession, and one that they alone can bring to the awareness of the general public.

Three years ago, in October, 1976, I attended a book fair in Baltimore where I got some answers to a questionnaire. The results were not impressive in numbers, but they were revealing. The major problem that book buyers were faced with and were willing to discuss were those of space and equipment to house their collections. The solid elegance of a massed collection, convenient to eye and hand, appeared to be the ambition of most book buyers. Organization, arrangement, and control of the content of their libraries were next in the concerns of book buyers. The eventual goal was less clearly stated; the intellectual ambition was nowhere near as well defined as the physical one. These are precisely the areas of expertise that engage the professional librarian, and one which they can address with authority.

Less than one-fifth of the respondents considered books alone as sufficient for their private libraries, 80 percent considered tapes, recordings, prints, photographs, all the accoutrements of intellectual communication, as part of the content of a personal library. For 60 percent, their private library provided housing and display for their own creative works, amateur or professional.

These are some of the problems of the neglected service. Who are the potential patrons for the service to private libraries and personal book ownership? Again, quoting from my 1976 questionnaire, the sample proved to be heavily middle-class. None of the respondents admitted to being lower-class, although they were given an opportunity to do so. I did not provide the criminal class any similar opportunity for self identification—perhaps that was a mistake and should be corrected. One percent of the respondents identified themselves as working-class, four percent left the question unanswered, 20 percent said they were upper-class, 75 percent declared themselves to be middle-class.

Income information showed book buying respondents to be reasonably well to do. In 1976, 20 percent had an income of over $30,000 annually, while 62 percent had an annual income between $15,000 and $30,000.

What would be the nature of programs that would involve and engage this group of patrons? Sixty-two percent saw their libraries and the expense of their libraries as being career or education expense; 36 percent saw their libraries as a recreational expense. Other aspects of personal book ownership would probably surface as new collectors and more mature collectors of private libraries met to encourage personal book ownership, mingle, and discuss problems, purposes, and satisfactions of book ownership. One of the respondents to the questionnaire identified a private library as a pleasant necessity. That would very well describe the nature of the programs that would engage the interest of book owners.

We have looked at the patrons, the programs, the problems—what would be the product of a service of this kind? I would like to see a registry of private libraries that would list some of the community resources in private collections. It is well to remember that book owners do not like to lend their books. One-third of the respondents to the questionnaire from which I have been quoting were adamant in their refusal to lend their books; the rest were unenthusiastic about lending their books. The value of a registry of private collections, in the range of interests it would show and the depth and diversity of community talent, rather than being a source for the reader looking for a book, would be a source for the book looking for a reader.

I received a brochure the other day that had just that dilemma to present. Did I know anyone who would profit from what it had to say? Did I know anyone who wanted to improve an existing process, trigger a whole new concept of manufacturing, or even create an entirely new industry? It would have been useful to have a registry of private libraries to refer to.

I wish to express my thanks for the opportunity to appear before the White House Conference. I have described the conditions, problems, programs, and product that are part of personal book ownership and a private library service. I wish to thank you for having focused your attention on this neglected group of patrons.

Sophie Mitrisin

Testimony Submitted by the Right Reverend Edward G. Murray

I am Father Edward G. Murray. I am Vicar for Ecumenical Affairs for the Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts, and Chairman of the Archdiocesan Ecumenical Commission. I have worked closely with public libraries for many decades. I want to talk to you today about the growing dependence on public library services by the elderly.

In 1900, the man or woman who lived beyond the age of 50 was the exception. At that time, only three percent of the population lived to be over 65; now 10 percent have already marked their 65th birthdays, more than 22 million persons. By the end of this century, the U.S. Census Bureau expects that number to have swelled to more than 30 million. Although the elderly now account for 10 percent of the population, they account for 25 percent of the poor. Free library service in their communities is vital to the growing numbers of older Americans.

Many older adults who regularly use libraries are "invisible" patrons who hold no library cards and never charge out books. Their use of the library is usually unrecorded. But for them, the library may be their most important resource, providing an opportunity to escape the confinement of their rooms, to sit and read comfortably among other people in a pleasant atmosphere.

There is widespread recognition that older Americans require a broad range of educational services to assist them in life-change situations and to find new outlets for their skills and interests. The "twilight years" notion that older adults have no capacity for continued mental growth or social contribution has largely been dispelled. Psychosocial research has proved without a doubt that age has nothing to do with intellectual acuity. Older people may not think as quickly as they once did, but their conclusions are just as sound and their store of information and vocabularies can grow indefinitely.

No one knows exactly how many older adults are enrolled in courses sponsored by colleges and universities. It is likely, however, that there are thousands attending classes each year. The Academy for Educational Development estimates that enrollment increased by nearly 2,600 percent during the five-year period from 1970 to 1975.

A Louis Harris survey in 1975 found that 400,000 older people were currently enrolled in an educational institution or taking courses. (This amounts to two percent of those 65 and over; five percent of the 40-to-64-age group are so enrolled.) Senior-citizen enrollment ranges from the college or university level (24 percent), to adult educational schools, church schools, high schools, and correspondence schools. An overwhelming majority of senior-citizen students (76 percent) say they are taking courses to expand general knowledge about some field or hobby.

Half of all elderly Americans—rich and poor—have no more than a high school education. Reduced income plunges the older person into a snarl of social services—food stamps, rent supplements, supplemental security income, Medicaid, Meals on Wheels, nutrition centers, reduced bus fares. An Urban Institute study recently concluded that the great majority of the elderly poor have at most an eighth-grade reading level, while government-prescribed procedures for many social welfare programs require substantially higher levels of reading skill and achievement. A sampling of 81 official documents found only 11 percent judged comprehensible to those with eighth-grade skills. A great many of the forms required college-reading-level comprehension. Not surprisingly, the Urban Institute suggests that this mismatch between a client's ability to read and welfare agencies' demands for literacy of its clients discourages persons eligible for benefits from enrolling, causes inequity in the distribution of benefits among enrollees, and leads to high agency error rates. For people who had led self-sufficient, dignified lives, the psychological anguish of attempting to cope can be devastating. The opportunity to turn for needed information to a public library, therefore, can sometimes make an important difference.

What are libraries doing to help meet the special needs of this growing sector of American society? Weakening eyesight, physical frailty, loss of hearing, the psychological problems of isolation from the mainstream of American life are inevitably part of the aging process. Various libraries supply a variety of special materials to help overcome these isolating barriers.

Elderly people who have difficulty reading normal-size print can usually find on the shelves of their local public library a collection of attractively designed, easy-to-read, large-print editions of best sellers, gothics, romances, Westerns, biographies, how-to books—just about every category of publication imaginable. Many libraries also carry the special large-print weekly edition of *The New York Times* and the large-print edition of *Reader's Digest*.

The availability of large-print materials is revolutionizing public library service to the elderly, a revolution largely stimulated by librarians themselves. Most public libraries in this country had none of these materials as recently as 10 years ago. Library of Congress Talking Books and books in braille are available to anyone who cannot read ordinary print, either because of visual impairment or a physical handicap that prevents them from being able to handle a book, such as the inability to turn a page or to sit up in bed. An estimated 60 percent of the persons served by this program are over 60.

The more than 576,000 readers who use these special materials receive them through a network of 56 regional and 102 subregional libraries. In most States there is only one library for the blind and physically handicapped—this is usually the State library. People are expected to write or telephone for the tapes, records, or braille books they wish to have mailed to them. Distribution and storage of these materials is not paid for by Congress; the cost must be borne by the State or local library agency. The Library of Congress estimates that as many as seven million people eligible to receive talking books are not now being reached.

Additional handicapped people could be reached through local, personilzed library service. Insufficient local funds have made this difficult, but where it has been tried results have been impressive. When the Great River (Illinois) Library System became a subregional library in the spring of 1973, approximately 85 handicapped users were being served with materials for the blind. Two years later, the number had reached over 500, an increase of 588 percent.

Volunteers are used by many public libraries to provide personal, individualized service to shut-ins. In Kenosha, Wisconsin, the public library has trained volunteers to read aloud at a center for the elderly. The Los Angeles Public Library has close to 250 volunteers working out of most of the 61 branches and the Central Library to circulate more than 5,700 books, cassettes, records, magazines, music scores, and other materials each month. Dallas' volunteers run the gamut from a television actor to a retired registered nurse, to a 75-year-old man who just completed a bachelor's degree in psychology and who also does volunteer work at the Mental Health Association.

At the Musser Public Library in Muscatine, Iowa, an hour's visit goes along with the fortnightly book delivery service, and the library makes a diligent effort to match volunteers with prospective clients according to reading interests and hobbies.

In Milwaukee, which prides itself on the breadth of its service to the elderly, an "over-60" bookmobile makes regular stops in Milwaukee County at large nursing homes (a van serves smaller institutions), homes for the aged, day centers, housing projects, and neighborhoods where many people over-60 live. The bookmobile is a mini-library carrying some 4,000 books to serve a wide variety of interests, as well as large-print books and foreign language materials. The bookmobile makes about 50 stops over a three-week schedule, each one lasting about 45 minutes. It is equipped with a hydraulic lift at the rear which is used for delivering loaded book carts to the nursing homes and for lifting aboard wheelchair patrons who wish to visit the bookmobile itself.

This huge and growing body of citizens needs and deserves adequate public library services. The obvious way to provide them is through a new National Library Act, which should be funded as soon as feasible.

Right Reverend Edward G. Murray

Testimony Submitted by Eugene T. Neely

My name is Eugene T. Neely, and I am Coordinator of Public Services, General Library, University of Missouri, Kansas City. I am also chairman of the Statistics Coordinating Committee of the Library Administration and Management Association, a division of the American Library Association.

As current Chairperson of the Statistics Section, I would like to call to the attention of as many as possible of the delegates to the White House Conference some of the problems which the library profession is now experiencing with the publication of library statistical data by the Federal Government.

In view of the pressing needs of individual libraries and of local, State, and national government agencies for current statistical information, underscored this year by the needs of the White House Conference, the Coordinating and Executive Committees of the Statistics Section, meeting in joint session at the ALA Dallas Conference last June, resolved that: "Whereas the Statistics Section of LAMA recognizes the great value of up-to-date information about libraries as collected in the National Center for Education Statistics' LIBGIS surveys, the Statistics Section strongly recommends that NCES give top priority to reducing the delay between the collection of library survey data and the publication of those data to make them quickly accessible and useful."

On page 60 of the analysis of pre-White House Conference activities, entitled *Issues and Resolutions,* which was published by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and mailed to all White House Conference delegates, the following suggested resolution appears: "The Federal Government should provide for the collection and dissemination of library statistics, using standard terminology. A minimum three-year production cycle should be maintained for all types of libraries."

ADDENDUM:

Proposed Resolution
on Library Statistical Surveys by the Federal Government

The resolution presented below is an expansion and amplification of the resolution included in *Issues and Resolutions: An Analysis of Pre-White House Conference Activities* (Theme 4, Goal 2, page 60):

Whereas, national library statistical surveys have been conducted since the 1870's by the U.S. Office of Education, and since 1966 by the National Center for Education Statistics, and are now being transferred to the Department of Education; and

Whereas, national library statistics have been used as a basic method for describing the characteristics of all types of libraries; and

Whereas library statistics have provided primary data for evaluating library services, performance, and needs; and

Whereas, library statistics have been used by Congress and various Presidential Administrations to improve legislation in support of libraries, such as the Library Services and Construction Act (1956), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), and the Higher Education Act (1965);

Therefore be it resolved, that the Secretary of Education be requested to retain *at least* the three-year cycle for basic library surveys (public, academic, and school), and that other surveys of libraries be conducted *at least* every six years, and that this schedule be maintained by the National Library Agency, should such agency be established by Congress; and

Be it further resolved, that new or repeated surveys on critical issues be regularly conducted in support of developing legislation such as that for the National Library Act, the National Periodicals Center, and the Library Manpower Study; and

Be it further resolved, that the results of library surveys conducted by the Federal Government be released in printed or other easily accessible form within 12 months after the deadline for return of survey forms by respondents; and

Be it further resolved, that the responsibility for library statistical surveys be placed under that office of the Department of Education responsible for administering other federally supported library programs, and that it be placed under the National Library Agency if and when such agency is established.

Eugene T. Neely
Statistics Section
Library Administration and Management Association
American Library Association

Testimony Submitted by James A. Nelson

Continuing Library Education

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services and the State-Level Governor's Conferences throughout the country have called for our profession to take a new look at the many needs of our many publics and meet these needs with a strong response from all library, information, and media organizations. The five Conference themes have been designed to encourage a call for action by lay and professional delegates who have come to Washington to forge a new, progressive leadership to take this mission into the 1980's.

A diversity of special interests are being shaped into a common concern for a progressive development and use of our services, resources, and personnel to address personal and social problems throughout the country. In this effort, many voices have been and will continue to be heard in the articulation of issues and the proposing of resolutions to shape our common future. The event itself has become a participant in moving the issues from the floor of debate to a course of action which will take us into what may be the most challenging decade we have ever faced.

When the course is marked; when our purpose is in motion, given the energy of this Conference and those preceding; when we initiate action at national, State, and local levels, there is one undergirding issue which must not be taken for granted—the education and training of all participants in this common endeavor. Every resolution coming to the White House Conference, and those which will emerge after, will have some kind of educational implication, because it is impossible to separate the learning and practice of any profession.

Without any doubt, the action called for in resolutions generated by this national process will urge changes in curricula, raise questions for new research, and focus on new kinds of faculty development. Margaret Goggin has spoken eloquently on the concerns of library education programs, and I know her words would be echoed many times over if other library educators were to testify before this Commission. Dr. Goggin covered all aspects of library education in her remarks, but I would like to amplify one critical part of the educational process which will play an increasingly important role as we move to implement changes called for by this Conference. I want to speak briefly to the issue of continuing library education.

In 1973, this very Commission established its support for continuing education by funding a national study which was intended to recommend a "national blueprint" for continuing library education. This study, led by Elizabeth Stone of Catholic University, resulted in the founding of the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE), a national organization with the sole purpose of encouraging and supporting continuing education development for library, information, and media personnel. NCLIS has continued to support this effort and CLENE's accomplishments have evidenced a good return on your investment.

Even though CLENE has made and continues to make progress through its programs, there is much to do, and no single organization can meet all the needs which our profession has for continuing education. In order to do this, we have to take on more responsibility for seeing to our own continuing education as individuals, but we also need help at all levels of government to assure access to, availability of, and quality control for learning opportunities to meet the educational needs of our profession.

At the national level, we must continue the research and demonstration grants, as well as the library training grants which have been whittled away to practically nothing (there is no appropriation in the 1981 appropriation for HEA IIB). There will be greater demands on the development of national training programs, especially utilizing the new technologies, and perhaps a need for new legislation to support these needs. NCLIS itself may have to come to the aid of start-up programs and push for the implementation of innovative continuing education projects.

At the State Level, coordination, financing, and development of statewide systems for continuing library education should be established to provide stability and direction for this critical need. Each plan for statewide library development must incorporate training components where new programs are needed, as well as a general continuing education plan for the library personnel in the respective States.

Local libraries and library systems need to support the continuing education of all their staff through release time, financial support, and administrative support for employees who return from their learning opportunities ready to test new knowledge and skills. With anywhere from 60 to 90 percent of our library budgets going to personnel-related costs, we cannot afford to ignore the development of this valuable resource.

Associations at all levels need to support continuing education in the many ways they do other areas of library development. The broad-base focus of association programs and the volunteer nature of these groups will allow a more generalizable development. A caution need be raised here, however; association leadership should be cautious about the illusory vision of entrepreneurial benefit from continuing education as a source of financial profit.

In the future, we all will have greater responsibility to integrate continuing education into the actions called for by this Conference. From our individual response and the organizational response of our collective selves, we have to look to education as a necessary strategy if we are to build a strong foundation to more into the 1980's. Education can create the stability needed to encompass the many changes implicit in resolutions generated by this major event.

James A. Nelson
Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange

Testimony Submitted by Charles O'Halloran

The following is a personal statement. I am employed as State Librarian by the Missouri State Library. This statement is entirely my own and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the State of Missouri, of the Missouri State Library, or of the members of the library community of Missouri. The statement is drawn, however, from my 25 years experience as a librarian, 15 of which have been as Missouri State Librarian.

There can be little doubt that one item which will be discussed at length, and perhaps finally endorsed by delegates to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, is the so-called National Library Act contained in "study bill" S.1124 introduced on May 14, 1979, by Senators Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.).

S.1124, although at this time only a document for study, analysis and discussion, has already been endorsed for its principles, goals, and objectives by a number of important library and library-related organizations, and, technicalities of language, procedure, or administration aside, may well prove attractive and highly appealing to White House Conference delegates who could view it as the beginning of the future for American libraries.

Let me quote two prefatory paragraphs from the bill: ". . . It is the policy of the United States to establish, support and expand educational opportunities for individuals of all ages and conditions; to provide individuals in need with information relating to health, employment, education, recreation, assistance to the elderly, and other publicly supported service programs; to guarantee to all persons the opportunity of equal access to public information; and to implement the constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press through free public access to open repositories of information of all kinds. In order to achieve the policy set forth in this section, it is essential that a National Library Agency be established to carry out a program to insure that an adequate level of library services is made available in all communities, to all individuals, without regard to their educational attainment, individual ability or economic condition.

". . . It is the purpose of this Act to assist the States: (1) in the provision, extension and improvement of public library services and with public library construction, (2) in the provision, extension and improvement of such other library services as services for physically handicapped, institutionalized, functionally illiterate, unemployed, limited English language skills, and economically and educationally disadvantaged individuals, (3) in strengthening State library administrative agencies and library personnel, and (4) in promoting interlibrary cooperation among all types of libraries."

Can any American, especially any American librarian, fault the noble sentiments expressed, or believe that S.1124 will produce anything other than much improved, vastly better library services in the United States?

Yes.

While I must admire the lofty goals and objectives of this bill; while I wish fervently to see accomplished the end results contemplated in this bill, I must, in a classic stance, reject the means, i.e., the Federal Government, chosen to achieve that end.

Obviously, since this bill is proposed Federal legislation, it necessarily provides that the Federal Government will do certain things for and to libraries.

Whenever and wherever the Federal Government undertakes to do something for the people—to "promote the general welfare"—

inevitably that action brings with it consequences which, though hardly unexpected are always undesirable.

Federal Government action brings:

- More civil servants and other dependents of the Federal Government. As the saying goes: "It is people, not things, that receive and spend money. Any Federal initiative which includes the acceptance of responsibility by the Federal Government and the appropriation, allocation, and use of Federal funds means that more and more people, more and more careers, more and more lives become dependent upon the Federal Government and upon the continuation and perpetuation of "their" Federal programs.

- More Federal spending. Clearly S.1124 contemplates sizeable amounts of money flowing from Federal sources in order to accomplish a variety of worthy purposes. This, in turn, means:

- More deficit spending or increased taxation. Old, new, or expanded Federal programs all must be paid for, and this either by increased taxation, a thing which the Congress shudders to contemplate especially in an election year, or by the trickery of borrowing and deficit spending. (The alternative to this, reallocation of Federal expenditures, is an idea beautiful to contemplate, and it would be even more beautiful to behold were the military/industrial lobby willing to curtail expenditures in favor of libraries; were the education lobby willing to defer to agriculture; were libraries prepared to sacrifice for the benefit of the Post Office, etc.).

- Less money in the private sector available for free marketplace expenditure. Increased taxes or borrowing with a scoopshovel means less money available not merely to individuals but to local and State governments.

- More inflation. Borrowing by the Federal Government, deficit spending, monetary manipulations, and "bidding up" costs in favored programs—all of these, either alone or together, are the Federal Govenment's highly efficient methods for fueling inflation.

- More scrambling for grants, more standing hat in hand, more placating, more dependence, more placid comformity to Federal regulation, more resignation to the inevitability of Federal domination on the part of more and more local communities and entire States.

- More pressure upon States and local communities to increase their own taxes and expenditures in order to "match" Federal grant funds.

- More Federal regulation since, after all, he who controls the money has every right to direct how it shall be spent.

- A loss, however small it may seem, of the right to make free and independent choices and decisions in the States and in local communities.

Given the evils attendant upon Federal intrusion and intervention into any facet of American life, most of us, I should think, since we were citizens of the country and inheritors of the American tradition long before we became involved with the special, even vested interest of libraries, should have no difficulty in rejecting Kennedy/Javits, not because of any question about the goals which it seeks to achieve, but because of the intolerable evils which will accompany it for all Americans, including librarians, should it ever become law.

As an alternative to pervasive Federal Government involvement in library affairs during the years to come, I offer to delegates at the White House Conference the following as parts of a program which all library interests might support and endorse with enthusiasm:

- A completely serious and thoroughgoing espousal of the Constitutional principle of federalism with a return to the States of the power, authority, and sovereignty which over recent decades have been abdicated to or seized by the Federal Government. Basic to this revival of a forsaken concept is a renewal of respect for the honesty, intelligence, and competence of the people in each of the States to work out their own destinies undirected by experts employed by the Federal Government.

- A Constitutional amendment which would mandate a balanced Federal budget, prohibit deficit spending, and require that any Federal expenditures in excess of income could take place only as a result of increased taxation.

- Legislation and, if necessary, a Constitutional amendment limiting Federal spending to a specific percentage of the Gross National Product. This action, together with the requirement for a balanced Federal budget, would go far toward eliminating inflation and could have the effect of freezing all Federal Government expenditures. It could also require that established Federal programs be either reduced or eliminated altogether if any new programs are to be proposed.

- A return of taxing power to the States, which action would result from limiting and reducing the taxing power of the Federal Government. This return of power would itself be a forceful reassertion of belief in the ability and general wisdom of the people in each State to decide their own destinies. (Because of the efficiency of the Federal Government's tax-collecting mechanisms, those mechanisms could, of course, be used to gather taxes for the States.)

- An abandonment of the two theories of redistribution which hold: a) that money should be taken from everyone and given to special interests; and b) that money should be diverted from frivolous, i.e., private, purposes to important, i.e., public, purposes.

- Decisions regarding matters which are "important" would be made not by the Congress but by the States. Because certain States will inevitably be less wealthy than are others, and some, in a relative sense, genuinely poor, sentiments of benevolence and charity could impel the wealthy States to wish to assist their poorer sisters through federally conducted grant programs. These programs should therefore be available only to certifiably poor States, i.e., those in which the per capita income is below the national average. In no way should these programs provide for the flow of Federal funds into States where per capita income equals or exceeds the national average.

- A steadfast, unyielding refusal to respond to the cries of the envious or to those of any special interest demanding preferment over others or undeserved attention from all.

- A reiteration of faith in the ability of the people in the States and local communities to care for themselves, and, in an atmosphere of freedom, to recognize, and then to solve their own problems.

This program would provide libraries with no Federal funds, with no Federal direction, with no Federal planning. In exchange for these questionable benefits, libraries would gain opportunities for heterogeneity, for variety, for the exercise of creativity and invention, and possibilities for providing their services, for helping their users, in a Nation of sovereign States in which the word freedom once again has meaning.

Charles O'Halloran

Testimony Submitted by Witold Plonski

Americans of Polish descent expect the White House Conference to affirm the right of all citizens to have access to materials that express values and aspirations of all ethnic groups in the United States. This individual right to desired information and materials is rooted in the American tradition of intellectual freedom guaranteed by the first amendment and affirmed by international agreements such as the Helsinki Accord.

The American library, as a major institution of the informative and educative system, is obligated to fulfill this right of all citizens. Their understanding of the pluralistic nature of our society is of primary importance for the well-being of this Nation, its unity, and peaceful and democratic development. The right to ethnicity-related information should not be overshadowed, as it frequently happens, by other pressing demands, search for new technologies or lack of adequate funding.

It is incumbent upon the American Library Association and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to take a more explicit stand on ethnic information in their planning of the national program and legislative policy. The Congress of the United States officially recognized the importance of the need for multicultural effort when it passed the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act in

1975. Therefore, it will respond positively to the recommendations of the American librarianship on ethnic information.

To assist the White House Conference in its deliberations on ethnicity-related information, we propose for consideration the following resolution:

Proposed Resolution

Whereas, this Conference supports expansion of library services to meet information needs of American citizens;

Therefore be it resolved, that libraries expand their services to include programs, materials, information service, and staff expertise necessary to reflect and meet the needs of our multicultural, multiethnic society; and

Be it further resolved, that Congress of the United States consider and approve legislation directed at full realization of individuals' right to ethnicity-related information.

Witold Plonski
Polish-American Ethnic Committee, Inc.

Testimony Submitted by Joyce Post

The American Society of Indexers was founded in 1968 to raise the low status of indexes and indexers in American publishing, to improve the quality of indexes, and to set standards for professional indexers. The Society has approximately 350 members in two categories: 1) indexers of books and other published materials who often work on a free-lance basis for publishers with whom they have built up a working relationship; and 2) employed indexers who work for commercial indexing firms or data base producers.

The Society, in this position paper, addresses itself to three issues for consideration at this Conference: 1) users of information and indexes; 2) publishers and indexes; and 3) libraries and indexes.

Users of Information and Indexes: The Society addresses itself to the first two theme areas around which this Conference is organized: libraries and information services to meet personal needs, and libraries and information services to enhance lifelong learning. Much of the effort of the delegates dealing with these themes will be devoted to identifying the types of information most needed to meet the personal demands of day-to-day living in today's overwhelming information environment. Along with identifying these user needs is the additional task of making such information publicly available to all, and in formats that do not discriminate against less sophisticated information users. But the job does not stop even here.

Once a useful body of information has been identified, it needs to be further analyzed so individuals using it can turn directly to those portions which specifically answer their information needs. This is accomplished only through indexes. If such indexes are not present, the information sitting, for example, in a book, a magazine, a government file or report, a list of local interest groups or human service agencies, a community information bank, or any other means by which information is made available, will do just that: sit there. Indexing is the key that will turn stagnant information into a dynamic useful tool.

This fact has long been recognized by the business and professional communities, and indexing services to aid these groups have been with us a long time. But the importance of information needs for decisionmaking in personal affairs has only recently surfaced, and the need to go one step further and index this type of information is recognized even less.

The American Society of Indexers recommends that a provision for indexing those bodies of information needed for personal needs and lifelong learning be included in the recommendations of delegates considering these information needs.

Publishers and Indexes: Many nonfiction books are published today without indexes. Of those that are indexed, many do not meet minimum index standards. The Society recommends that these situations be corrected immediately.

Publishers should realize that both the sales value and usefulness to readers of any nonfiction work are greatly lessened if there is no index. Publishers should also appreciate that within the entire publication process, the indexing stage is just as important as any other stage. It should not be regarded as a postscript to be done at the eleventh hour by an inexperienced person.

The American Society of Indexers makes two recommendations for immediate action: 1) that all nonfiction books and printed materials have indexes; and 2) that these indexes meet a recognized standard such as that formulated by the American National Standards Institute, Committee Z39.4, USA Standard Basic Criteria for Indexes.

We propose that this be done in the following two ways: 1) that a dialogue be opened between this Society and the other publishing groups attending this Conference to explore mutual interests and work out individual differences regarding the presence and quality of indexes in nonfiction books and other printed works; and 2) that this Conference affirm the desirability of the above two recommendations regarding printed works by supporting a dialogue for this purpose between publishers and indexers.

Libraries and Indexes: Libraries will have to reassess their role in the information-rich environment of the next decade. Coupled with dwindling financial resources with which to purchase ever more expensive books, resources, and information products, the last few years have seen the rise of nonlibrary organizations that provide information searching and consulting services for a fee.

A recognition of the value of indexes and a requirement that they be present in all information products purchased by libraries, and also that such indexes meet acceptable criteria, will help libraries through this reassessment period. Libraries should understand that if access to the data within the information products found on their shelves is not made through indexes, these products will not be fully used and yet, indirectly, will be costly to libraries purchasing, processing, and storing them. In this time of reduced funds, libraries must take a hard look at the indexes of all the information products they consider for purchase. They, and the reviewers of these books and information products for the library press, should not be afraid to reject such materials if they do not meet acceptable standards for information access.

There will be much discussion at this Conference of both the proposed National Library Act and some sort of national-level library authority or coordinating agency. These are viewed as possible ways of determining priorities, appropriating funds, and guiding cooperative bibliographic and resource-sharing efforts in a time of less government spending for libraries, changing library roles, and technological breakthroughs in information packaging and delivery. The ultimate goal of all these national-level proposals is increased availability of resources for library users. The planners of such national-level proposals should ensure that provisions for indexes along the lines set forth in this position paper be included in whatever legislation and/or coordinating agency they design. For example, any plan for a national library and information coordinating agency should include a policymaking index division charged with the responsibility of ensuring that useful indexes appear in all appropriate print and nonprint information resources.

The American Society of Indexers urges this Conference to consider the following two points when recommending library priorities: 1) that individual libraries require that good indexes, relative to the needs of intended users, be present in any book or information product they purchase: and 2) that any national legislation or coordinating body established to oversee library and information services policymaking include a distinct index division.

Indexes in the Future: Up to this point, every idea expressed in this position paper has been concerned with conventional information sources, whether they be the older, more traditional printed formats or the newer on-line formats. We don't have to look too far into the future to see even more exciting changes in information formats and delivery. The home computers of today will be replaced with total interactive information systems where a single information utility will have many capabilities, from making airline reservations directly from a schedule appearing on a television screen to using that same screen to look up an article in an encyclopedia. Electronic publication will eliminate the need for multiple copies of the same product. Newspapers, for example, will be read on a television screen, and hard copies of journal articles will be transmitted from one part of the world to another by telefacsimile copiers.

These changes will also mean changes in indexes as we now know them. New formats for making them available will have to be explored, and the immediacy with which they will need to be prepared will become of increasing concern. The American Society of Indexers expresses its confidence in the information formats of the future and its eagerness to participate in the indexing challenges that will accompany them.

Joyce Post
American Society of Indexers

Testimony Submitted by Paxton P. Price

I am the Executive Director of the Urban Libraries Council, an organization representing urban public libraries throughout the United States and Canada. It is composed of 112 libraries which serve, in aggregate, over 50 million people.

I would like to call the attention of the Conference to the National Library Act (S.1124), a study bill introduced in the Congress last spring with bipartisan sponsorship. My remarks will be confined to the rationale for this legislation and the need for this Conference to favor its enactment.

The National Library Act has been proposed for adoption by this Conference as one of the recommendations it will issue to the President and the Congress, to correct the incomplete effectiveness of present Federal financial assistance to public libraries. The present Federal program, originally enacted with limited purposes, has been amended several times and increased in dollar amounts, but when the larger urban public libraries were the first to suffer fiscal disaster when the sources of their local income were subjected to crippling inadequacies, this present Federal program offered no consequential relief. The Nation must take steps to curb and prevent these catastrophies from happening again.

Since the States, when these dire fiscal circumstances struck, were not then in a position to effectively come to the aid of these stricken institutions, the time has arrived, if indeed it has not passed, for the country to undergird its public library service with a financial support plan that provides multigovernmental level contribution. The National Library Act embodies that very scheme, as well as a new departure feature in Federal financial aid that acts as a sustaining stimulus for other governmental level support.

The National Library Act was conceived and constructed in concert with known segments of the library community who had legislative interests. The Act evolved from an open meeting to which all were invited to offer their concepts and needs for an improved legislative program. The resulting study bill is endorsed by legislative committees of trustees, State librarians, and the public library administrators.

The proposed National Library Act thus represents applied legislative research which constitutes a considerable achievement in group dynamics, but it is still an unfinished recommendation—a mere proposal. In actuality, the Act awaits further refinement through the legislative process from other segments of our system of governments and with other concepts that may emerge from this Conference. But, important above all, the National Library Act constitutes a collectively refined beginning which obviates the need to expend further time to construct another bill in its stead.

The forerunning LSA and the present LSCA have had sufficient time to bring about the changes in circumstances in the several States which they were designed to correct. But, during the course of their existence new economic events have occurred which are unaffected by LSCA and which have made deep inroads in the extent and quality of services expected of public libraries. To prevent further deterioration by these same economic forces, there is now a need for a replacement Federal library law that counteracts sudden and stringent decline of public service, which is so overwhelmingly dependent upon only one source of income—the local property tax. The National Library Act would reduce this unpredictable decline to shore up the public library's financial support from insufficiently engaged State sources. The present division of library support depends upon 82 percent from local sources (now strained and straining to limits of endurance everywhere), 13 percent from State sources, and only five percent from Federal sources; and it is obvious to all that this imbalance, and this crippling arrangement, has no present prospect for being righted. The decline of public library service is inevitable, unless corrective measures are adopted as is promised by the National Library Act.

State governments, obligated as they are in principle and legal determination to support educational services from public libraries equally with what they provide in public education, have yet to assume their proper share of the library's financial support. While it is true that State government has improved this kind of attention in recent decades, the full extent expected from this governmental level has not been realized. Of all levels of government, the State level is in better financial condition than the others; which leads us to recommend the institution of a stimulus to yield this missing share. This stimulus is written into the National Library Act. The Urban Libraries Council endorses and supports the principles, goals, and objectives contained in the proposed National Library Act as an aid and stimulus needed for fulfillment of the potential effectiveness of public library service over the Nation.

A radical cure must be contrived and implemented quickly, before the very fabric of this public service gives way and fails the public, which depends upon it for a well-spring of social renewal in this democratic society.

The Urban Libraries Council recommends adoption by the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, as one of its final recommendations to the President and the Congress, that the National Library Act be enacted and funded early.

This action would, in and of itself, assist and promote the achievement of the other Conference recommendations to emerge.

Paxton P. Price
Urban Libraries Council

Testimony Submitted by Harold Russell

I am Harold Russell, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped greatly appreciates this opportunity to present testimony to this hearing.

The computer is part of our high technology industry. It is here to stay. Through computer-based technology, coupled with other scientific techniques, we are able to store and retrieve information instantaneously. With the aid of COMSAT, we can send information half-way around the world nearly as fast as we can fly from Washington to Chicago. The high technology industry is growing at a rapid pace. In fact, it is the fastest growing industry today. It is opening career opportunities to able-bodied and disabled individuals alike.

The opportunities are increasing many-fold for job-ready disabled individuals as a result of affirmative action regulations governing Federal contracts to provide goods and services to the Federal Government, and as a result of anti-discrimination regulations relating to recipients of Federal funds. At the White House Conference, we are hearing a great deal about sophisticated, computerized information systems which are changing the library from a book lender to a very valuable information delivery agency or an important link in every community's resource referral effort. Consequently, we can look for an expansion in the need to have trained people—more people—to make the system work.

With this increased opportunity has come a great concern. Are the trained people—especially disabled individuals—available to take these jobs? In truth, we must say we do not know.

A case in point: The Electronics Industry Foundation has had a program to train and place 3,000 disabled people in jobs in the high technology industry. To date, the foundation has been able to find and place less than 100. Other employers who have developed cooperative training and placement programs report regularly they are having difficulty finding job-ready disabled individuals. And, if one examines the ads in our newspapers and many scientific magazines, I don't have to tell you that all components of the high technology industry have jobs—good jobs—that are going begging because employers can't find many qualified able-bodied takers either.

I don't need to remind you that every time we receive erroneous information, every time we receive a wrong bill, we decide we want to kick that darn computer. Actually, the computer may not be at fault. We submit it is high time we stop kicking the computer or blaming it. After all, the computer can only do what we human beings tell it to do. It can only provide the information we put in. Clearly, something must be done to address this problem. Therefore, we recommend action that can be taken now.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services, The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the American Library Association should take steps to get the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of the U.S. Office of Education, the Rehabilitation Services Administration, and the Employment and Training Administration and Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor to jointly undertake a study to determine the availability of handicapped and nonhandicapped workers who are job-ready to enter high technology positions.

Specifically, we need to know: Are people interested in these jobs? If they are, are they in training for them? If they are not, why not and what can be done to attract people into them? Another good question that needs an answer: Are there disabled people out there to be trained for positions in high technology industries, or are we overselling the market?

Finally, what about the training system itself? Is it capable of producing the people—both able-bodied and disabled—that the high technology industry is clamoring for? If it is not, what needs to be done—what can be done—to bring the training system up to standard so that it can produce the people?

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, we submit that the answers to these questions are crucial to the success libraries will have in serving their public, given the change taking place in librarianship and in the information stage, retrieval delivery, and dissemination field. We ask your support for this very vital information so that progress may continue.

Harold Russell
President's Council on Employment of the Handicapped

Testimony Submitted by Miv Schaaf

I am Miv Schaaf, alternate from Pasadena, California. I am on the board of the Friends of the Pasadena Public Library and am founder of the Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission. I write a twice weekly column for *The Los Angeles Times.*

Our children are being trained to be consumers, told that happiness is found in buying things. If we want them to find that joy is to be found in using your mind as well as using your money, we must begin early. For this reason I wrote with Sandy Schuckett the resolution the California delegates adopted at the California Governor's Conference on March 4 in Sacramento, and reaffirmed unanimously at the August and October follow-up meetings. It is foremost in the California Position Paper. The resolution is:

"Establish as mandatory in the State education codes that a specific amount of time for instruction in library usage shall be set beginning in grade K and continuing through grade 12."

As an alternate to this Conference, I have been asked by our delegates to read our final *California Position Paper:*

The California delegation reaffirms the American right and tradition of free and open public libraries. We reaffirm the recommendations of the 300 delegates to the March, 1979, California Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services:

1) Libraries must reach out to the unserved and the underserved. All barriers—physical, financial, legal, attitudinal, and technological—must be eliminated so as to serve everyone.

2) Continuous, ongoing funding to be mandated—Federal, State, and local. Best use of such monies must be made, eliminating overlap and duplication while maintaining high standards and local control.

3) Establish as mandatory in the State education codes that a specific amount of time for instruction in library usage shall be set beginning in grade K and continuing through grade 12.

4) Libraries must stir themselves, reach out to get people involved in an enjoyable use and political promotion of their libraries.

5) Libraries are invisible. Libraries must wake up the public, tell them what joys, information, services, programs are to be found in libraries and what dangers face libraries.

6) Libraries must be aware of and take advantage of political, social, economic, and technological changes, seeing that current information is made easy for everyone to use.

7) We support the Public Library Association's mission statement.

8) We support, in concept, the National Library Act.

Miv Schaaf
California Delegation to WHCLIS

Testimony Submitted by Sandy Schuckett

The California delegation to the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services reaffirms the American tradition of a free and open institution for information, education, and culture known as the public library. We believe libraries have an obligation to reach out to the unserved and the underserved, and that all barriers to such service must be removed.

We fully support a National Library Act, which will mandate guaranteed continuous Federal funding on a matching Federal/State/local basis, minimum standards for library services, adequate citizen participation, library services for special needs, and interlibrary cooperation programs. We further believe that the Act should be expanded to include school, college, medical, research, and other libraries.

We believe support for an improvement in library and information service must come about through an informed public who knows what is happening and what is needed, and that this is an essential duty for all libraries.

We must make certain that needed information is produced and that it is disseminated in such a way that those who need it can find it and use it.

Our children are the future of this Nation and the future of libraries. For this reason, the California delegation, at our Governor's conference in March of this year, supported by an 89 percent vote, the resolution that a specified amount of time be set aside for instruction in library use at all grade levels—kindergarten through twelfth grade—in the libraries of our public schools. We believe that through such instruction, begun when a child first enters school, positive attitudes toward libraries and what they have to offer can be instilled. The school library, with an organized, developmental instructional program can furnish not only materials of consistent excellence, but also a background of information which stimulates growth in literary appreciation, factual knowledge, cultural and aesthetic values, and opposing sides of issues so that good judgment and critical thinking can be developed in our children. A school library program can inculcate in children a lifetime habit of research skills which becomes automatic and internalized. The kinds of skills taught in school libraries are so basic to literacy that they can serve students throughout all levels of their schooling—elementary school through doctoral programs. For students who choose *not* to attend institutions of higher learning, these habits will serve as an open door to future library use which will meet personal needs and increase learning at any given time throughout their lives. These skills can be used in any type of library in any location and can serve for a lifetime.

A child who has access at an early age to an organized program of library skills and literature appreciation will probably grow up to be a tax-paying supporter and user of libraries all of his or her life.

Therefore, the California delegation, in agreement with those of Arizona, Michigan, New York, Texas, Florida, Connecticut, all of whom supported similar resolutions in their State conferences, strongly urges the members of this Commission to support with complete commitment a School Library Instructional Component as an essential section of the National Library Act.

Sandy Schuckett
California Delegation to WHCLIS

Testimony Submitted by Tryntje Van Ness Seymour

My name is Tryntje Van Ness Seymour. I am part-time public information officer for the national Citizens Emergency Committee to Save Our Public Libraries and editor of its newsletter on library needs and problems, *Private Wire*. I have attended nine Governor's Conferences, and my job requires me to review all available press clippings on the financial plight of public libraries.

The present economic situation of America's public libraries should be a source of shame for a Nation which pretends to be cultured, well-educated, and civilized. We have permitted the financial burden of public libraries to fall on the shoulders of those least able to bear it—the middle-income families who spend a disproportionate share of their resources on regressive property and sales taxes. The result has been predictable. Many libraries have watched their funding base erode away. Others have become the victims of taxpayer strikes, like California Proposition 13. The impact has been felt by libraries large and small, in all corners of the Nation.

In Cynthiana, Kentucky, employees at the city's public library do not earn the Federal minimum wage of $2.95 an hour. Just last month, when the library board found it was unable to pay a promised raise because of lack of funds, three of the library's staff of five employees resigned. "We felt we were worth the Federal minimum wage," said one of them, Lois McCauley, who had served as a Cynthiana librarian for nine years and earned $2.60 an hour.

The salaries at the Louisville public library were so low last year that the library could not compete with the starting salaries offered at nearby Jefferson Community College, the University of Louisville, or Jefferson County Schools. The problem has been temporarily solved, thanks to the special efforts of a new Friends group which publicized the budget plight and successfully prodded the city and county governments into providing a 24.5 percent budget increase this year.

The Free Library of Philadelphia's last minute financial reprieve from the City Council budget saved the library from having to shut down 12 branches. But the Friends of the Library report that it was not enough. The library is still $2 million short and suffering from a staff reduction of 107 employees (14 percent); the elimination of all outreach programs, including service to the homebound, hospitals, prisons, and day-care centers; and the cut-back of $550,000 from the book budget, while the cost of books continues to climb upward at the rate of 10 percent a year.

The public library budget crunch is not confined to big cities. The town of Lake Zurich, Illinois (population 6,789), woke up recently to discover that its library staff had begun to move books and other library materials into storage because of lack of space. Federal funds for new library construction under LSCA have been cut back to zero, and hard-hit local taxpayers in Lake Zurich have three times rejected ballot proposals to assume the full burden of funding the new library space.

The brand new $500,000 public library in Point Pleasant, West Virginia, has had a sign on its front door, "Closed until further notice." Federal LSCA funds financed the start of construction on the library, but the money has stopped coming and local funding is nonexistent.

Earlier this year the electricity, heat, and telephone services at the Mason, West Virginia, Public Library were shut off for lack of funds in the county budget. And out in Mason City, Iowa, the public library's book budget is so pressed that local citizens recently launched an emergency drive to raise $10,000 so the library can buy enough new books.

To borrow from the old story, this is one "heckuva way" to run a public library system. The time for catch-as-catch-can financing should be behind us. We are no longer talking about institutions that simply provide light reading for pleasure. The public library has become the community's encyclopedia of hard facts, a reference library for student and adult researchers, a children's reading room, young adults' library, adult education facility, senior citizens second home. Many public libraries also serve as information and referral centers for social services; job opportunity and career development resources; focal points for programs to reach the poor and undereducated; library service centers for institutions; and special libraries for the blind and handicapped.

Every public library should be sufficiently funded in regular annual governmental budget allotments to provide an adequate level of library service to all segments of the general population within the library's area of service: young children, older students, adult researchers, senior citizens, and those of all ages who seek advancement or self-education. The logical way to do this is on a straight per capita of population budget allocation.

Government grants should also be provided for special user services in those communities where the need for special services exists and extra staff and materials are required (such as job counseling, literacy training, prison library services). These grants should be sufficient for the costs of the necessary additional materials, technology, and hiring and training of personnel to permit affirmative library action programs to reach and help those citizens who need such services.

We do not have a level of public library financing today which permits such operations. A small number of communities and States may have approached that point, but it has been largely by chance.

The period of hit-or-miss planning should be behind us. We know now what basic services public libraries should be providing today, and we know that special services can help meet the special needs in most communities. The time has come to put these lessons into use. The time has come to bring about a national program of public library funding that will assure fair access to public library service on an equal basis to all Americans.

Congress should enact, and the President should sign into law, a new National Library Act to provide a stable and equitable funding base for America's public libraries, and the Act should be fully funded at the earliest possible date.

Tryntje Van Ness Seymour
Citizens Emergency Committee to
Save Our Public Libraries

Testimony Submitted by Whitney North Seymour, Jr.

We were warned many years ago that if we came to depend upon Washington to tell us when to sow and when to reap, we would soon be without bread. The author of the warning was in a good position to give us advice about government—Thomas Jefferson. Two centuries later, the advice is still sound, and nowhere is it more applicable than in the case of public libraries.

The free public library has grown up as a unique American institution. It was created, nurtured, and supported by local citizens and local units of government. Library boards and librarians are often cantankerous, belligerent, pig-headed, outspoken—and so are its users. But it is exactly for this reason that a local public library can be a bastion of liberty in the truest sense of the word. It has nurtured independent spirits like Harry -b5Truman, whose entire education consisted of reading every book in his local library. It has contributed to books of protest which have changed the course of the nation, books like Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*. It has stimulated great discoveries in science, including space technology. It has generated ideas, research, dissent, opposition—and most of all, free speech and a free press. That is because librarians and trustees have been independent "cusses" who do what they perceive is right in choosing materials and building collections without interference from State and Federal officials.

I am a strong advocate for a new National Library Act. Like many other citizens, I fervently believe that libraries should receive a fair share of the taxes we send to Washington and to the State capitals. But I also share the concern that money for basic library operations must not come with any Federal or State strings attached as to how it is to be spent.

The Javits-Kennedy bill is designed to accomplish just that. The concept for funding of basic library operations is a natural evolution of the present Library Services and Construction Act: the initial plan for per capita allocation of funds is prepared within each State. If the plan complies with simple statutory criteria, the Federal administrator must pay out the money.

Twenty-five years of experience under LSCA and its predecessor statutes have shown that this all can be accomplished *without* Federal interference or control. That experience is extremely valuable both as an assurance and as a guide.

When it comes to making the final decisions on the governance of the administrative structure under the proposed National Library Act, we must keep two principles clearly in mind: 1) the chief Federal administrator must be kept under tight statutory reins when it comes to approving payments of per capita matching funds under Title II for general library operations. He or she should not be vested with broad discretion to approve or disapprove State plans in light of how the local libraries plan to spend the money they receive. That is their decision to make, and theirs alone; and 2) the operations of the National Library Agency in other fields, such as networking and special services, should be subject to strong input and guidance from an appointed, nonpolitical group of independent citizens and professionals who are primarily concerned for the strength and vitality of libraries, rather than the strength and vitality of the current Administration in power. The national library program must never become a vehicle for pork-barreling or payment for political favors.

Whatever form the final National Library Act takes, these two guiding principles must be uppermost in the minds of the draftsmen in order to insure the continued freedom of the free public libraries of America.

Whitney North Seymour
Citizens Emergency Committee to
Save Our Public Libraries

Testimony Submitted by Dorothy Shields

My name is Dorothy Shields and I am the assistant director of the Department of Education of the AFL-CIO. On behalf of the AFL-CIO, its members, and their families, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in these open hearings before the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science during this White House Conference.

The labor movement in this country has long been an advocate for the free public library in the communities of this Nation. Indeed, we have a proud history and consistent record of support and testimony for library funding and adequate budget in almost every community in the country. Our concern and support for the community public library parallels our ongoing struggle to achieve free, quality public education for all Americans. In the early establishment of the public library, labor envisioned the continuing educational opportunities for all its members, children and adults together. In 1926, the American Federation of Labor, in convention, called attention to the necessity of the indispensable cooperation of librarians to assist unions in their educational work, particularly in the field of adult education. The AFL recommended "that unions everywhere seek the friendly aid of librarians and that the American Library Association be kept advised of our needs and plans." We would have to say that we have had mixed success with our hopes and our plans in this regard.

Labor's stake in the public library system is both individual and institutional, indeed, labor's stake is an equity interest. Union members have a stake as workers, taxpayers, parents, citizens, and members. Unions themselves have a stake as educators and advocates for social reform and as partners in the collective bargaining process. Our findings indicate that librarians suffer from misconceptions and lack of information about both roles. We are here today to attempt to alleviate that condition and to promote a closer working relationship between two institutions important in the lives of working people.

Our members, as parents, look to the public library as a repository of rich resource material for their youngsters to use, particularly with special school assignments. At the AFL-CIO, we have a special program underway to introduce the study of labor into the curriculum in elementary and secondary schools. We hope the public library will be the added dimension to complement the efforts underway in the classroom. By resource material on labor, we are not only talking about bulletins published by the Department of Labor, as important as they may be, but we are also talking about material that reflects the contribution of the laboring man to the development of the democracy, to music and literature, to the progressive social legislation for the safety, health, and welfare of the workers and their families.

We are talking about resources that illustrate the partnership of labor and management in the settling of thousands of collective bargaining agreements peacefully, rather than just those disputes that have reached an impasse. We are asking that the contributions of the working man and woman and their union toward the development of this country be given a fair and balanced representation in the collections and programs of the public library.

You may have assumed that this was the case. Unfortunately, we have evidence that it is far from true, although there has been exceptional service rendered by such great institutions as the

Brooklyn Public Library and the Minneapolis and New York Public Libraries to cite just a rare few.

I mentioned that in 1926 the AFL suggested we keep the American Library Association aware of our concerns, and we have worked closely with the ALA down through the years. In 1945, we formalized our relationship with the establishment of the Joint Committee on Library Services to Labor Groups (AFL/CIO-ALA) (RASD), composed of union members and professional librarians appointed by the respective sponsoring organization. This committee has worked effectively, providing and promoting services to labor through publication of newsletters, bibliographies, labor programs at the annual ALA meeting, and occasional surveys on library services to labor. In 1976, the most recent survey was conducted among public libraries located in communities of over 10,000 residents and having a central labor council. I will attach a full report of that survey to this paper; however, I wish to highlight some particular findings that we found to be very disturbing.

Attitudinal factors indicated that many librarians mistrust unions and dismiss them as valid consumer groups—our 13.6 million members notwithstanding. This was indicated by one particular comment, although it was echoed in others, "Ask (union) members to check them (books) out, not steal them." Another public librarian stated, "Unions will ruin the United States. This library does not wish to assist in our country's downfall."

Several librarians suggested purchasing high interest, low vocabulary or even literacy materials for union membership, attesting to their assumption that union members had reading problems and ignoring the reality of the education level of the average union member today—high school graduate and above. It is very difficult to repair and maintain modern equipment and machinery or fly a 747 to Paris and not be able to read!

Many librarians went out of their way to indicate that basic information about union organizing should be excluded from the public library. I can't imagine how a student is to study the struggle of the migrant farm worker to gain equity in this economy in such a library.

The survey was significant to us. We therefore cannot assume librarians recognize labor's contribution without some further assistance, education, and in-service training. Moreover, librarians must have the cooperation and support of local unions in their areas to further their mutual goals. The national AFL-CIO can be helpful in bringing this about. The survey was also helpful in that it elicited information as to what specific cooperation librarians would like from labor unions. Three main areas of support indicated were: financial support for materials, staff or services; financial and individual support for the library's building program; and donations of books, materials and volunteer time. One hundred seventy-seven libraries responded that they would like some of the above support from unions; but of that number, 88 percent has never made an outreach effort to the union community. I would say we both have a great deal of work to do to more realistically understand each other and offer complementary assistance.

Specifically, we would like to see labor, along with other consumer groups, represented on library trustee boards in recognition of their role in the community. We ask for a balanced presentation of the contribution of the labor movement in the library collections, not necessarily confined to the history or business section.

We ask that local librarians have the necessary technical information and economic data to provide help for unions in their collective bargaining research efforts, or to make such data available to them through regional library lending facilities.

We ask that librarians take a fresh look at the composition of the American labor movement and discard their caricature impression of working people, a caricature no more valid than that of the "typical" librarian.

We ask that public librarians be impartial in their labor-management judgments when selecting materials for their libraries as in the case of union organizing.

We ask that public librarians work with union members and their families as major consumers of library services and we in turn shall encourage our members to continue to be enthusiastic advocates for the public support so desperately needed for libraries to fulfill their educational services for all citizens.

ADDENDUM:

Labor Collections and Services
in Public Libraries
throughout the United States
1976

by
Kathleen Imhoff and Larry Brandwein

Introduction: Public libraries in communities over 10,000 and having a central labor council were surveyed in the spring of 1976 by the AFL/CIO-ALA (RASD) Joint Committee on Library Services to Labor Groups to ascertain the status of existing labor collections and services throughout the United States.

The Joint Committee, established in 1945, had as its original purpose the discovery of "ways of encouraging and assisting public libraries to develop specialized library services which will be useful to labor groups." This original purpose was later expanded to encouraging laborers to make better use of the services which many libraries had to offer. To these ends, the Committee sponsored the project which led to the publication of *Library Service to Labor.*[1] This publication of a collection of articles by various authors covered broad topics, i.e., the needs of labor; establishing and operating a labor service; various types of materials in collections; unions, their educational programs and the library; publicizing and promoting labor services; case studies (1948-49)—Akron, Boston, Milwaukee, New York, Newark[2]; and reading lists. Many of the articles had been printed in other publications of the committee, but it was felt in 1963 that librarians were becoming increasingly aware of the special needs of labor and that labor was becoming increasingly conscious of many library services that were available to help them become better unionists and informed citizens.

Since the late 1960's, in many libraries there has been a shift in emphasis from treating labor as a special group and providing them with special services, to treating labor as a group of patrons with no "special" needs. The shift away from treating labor as a special group can be seen as part of the general shift in emphasis (brought on in part by LSCA Title I grant priorities) to the economically and culturally disadvantaged and the bilingual patron. Also, during the 1960's in many libraries there appeared to be a general shift away from all special collections. However, this doesn't necessarily hold true since many libraries established black history, women's studies and Native American collections. Service to labor wasn't in the forefront at this time except in particular libraries, i.e., Minneapolis Public Library and Brooklyn Public Library.

In 1967, the committee felt it was necessary to provide all libraries working with labor groups the latest information regarding services available. In conjunction with the National Institute of Labor Education at the American University and the American Library Association, 950 questionnaires were mailed out to public libraries with annual book budgets over $10,000; 384 were returned, but the results were not published. Reference will be made to the 1967 survey, for comparison with the 1976 survey, at various points in the paper.[3]

The *Library Services to Labor Newsletter* was discontinued in 1970 as part of a cost saving effort of ALA. Although the committee published the pamphlet *Library Services to Labor Groups—A Guide to Action, 1975* to stimulate libraries to serve labor, it was felt there was no current information on the level of service to labor groups. Hence, it was decided to develop a questionnaire: 1) to gather information on existing service, both collection information and program information; 2) to ask about future plans for service to labor groups; 3) to determine what help the library would like to have from the union if the library planned to develop a service program for labor; and 4) to obtain information which would act as a guide for the committee's publication program.

The group of libraries the committee chose to survey was all public libraries in cities of 10,000 having a central labor council. Based on these criteria, 723 questionnaires (copy of the questionnaire is at the end of the article) were mailed. Some did go to regional and State libraries if they met the criteria. The committee reasoned that libraries located in areas with central labor councils were more likely to have special services or collections for labor groups and also that these areas would normally have a greater need for such services. The 10,000 population requirement for cities included in the survey was the arbitrary numerical cutoff on which the committee decided.

The committee determined it was important to up-date the information available on libraries that have "special collections" for labor. In order to do this, the first question asked was, "Does the library system have a special collection of materials for use by labor unions and/or organizations?" If libraries answered yes to this question, there were eight other questions for the respondent to answer giving additional information on the special collection. A weakness in the questionnaire was that the committee did not define what we thought of as a "special collection." Hence, we received yes answers from libraries that had anywhere from 35 books in the special collection to 60,000 items. I think this lack of definition caused some confusion in being able to answer this question.

A three-page pretest questionnaire to determine and improve the questionnaire's validity was sent to 10 public libraries[4] throughout the United States. The public libraries in the pretest were all located in large cities having central labor councils. Cities where it would be expected there might be a special collection were specifically chosen for the pretest. Several questions were modified, changed, or eliminated based on the results and comments returned from the pretest.

Before I report a summary of the findings from the survey, I would like to make some general observations that I feel might have influenced the responses:

1) Libraries seem to be in a dilemma about what they should do with special collections per se. In many libraries, the trend appears to be toward integrating the previously separate materials into the total collection. This is not universally the case. Many libraries showed a bias against having any special collection. When the committee asked questions about special *labor* collections, I think the bias that was often expressed was bias against special collections as a whole not particularly against special labor collections.

2) "Do we have any unions in Huron, S.D.?" This question penciled in by a respondent typified another problem with the questionnaire responses. Many libraries were not aware or were uncertain if there were unions or central labor councils in their area, even though questionnaires were only sent to cities having central labor councils.

3) Many responses indicated that the librarians assumed labor unions were very well established so there was no need to provide special service unless the union wanted to pay for the service. The fact that out of 90 million workers, only 15-16 million belong to labor unions would seem to indicate that this is not true. Nuts and bolts information about organizing unions should also be included in libraries, although many libraries responding specifically said this type of material had no place in a public library and should be

excluded. Even though the committee had not asked for opinions on this matter, many respondents felt strongly enough to write on the questionnaire that the library was not the place for information on union organizing.

4) Another factor which seems to have colored many of the responses is the assumption that local unions have large amounts of money to spend and that they should pay for special services or materials made available at the library. This is an unrealistic expectation since most local unions have very small budgets and couldn't afford to do this. The great amount of publicity that large salaries of national union leaders receive and the large contributions made to political candidates at the national level have perhaps led to this assumption.

5) Based on the responses received, many of the librarians appeared to lack the understanding that information on labor unions is a necessary part of the library collection. They expressed the feeling that if it is necessary, someone else will or should provide it. Perhaps this is because many librarians are from a socio-economic group that would make them unfamiliar with organized labor.

The above five points will be illustrated with specific responses from the tabulations appearing later in the paper.

Results of the Survey: Of the 723 questionnaires mailed out in the Spring, 385, or 53.2 percent, were returned. The 1967 survey had a 40.4 percent return. At least one public library in each State responded with the exception of the States of Delaware, Hawaii, and New Hampshire.

The first group of findings pertains to libraries with special collections of labor materials. Eighteen libraries responded that they did have special collections of materials for use by labor unions and/or organizations. Forty-six libraries reported special labor book collections in the 1967 survey. Information provided by the Library of Congress' various divisions is located at the end of the paper since their collection is unique.

Of the 317 libraries that said they did not consider their labor materials a special collection, all of these respondents indicated they had some labor materials. The number of materials in the collection varied from 4 to 5,250 items. The average number of labor materials in a collection was 498. Only 50 of the libraries surveyed either said that they had no labor materials at all or did not answer the question.

When questioned about special information services that currently exist in the libraries for labor unions and or their membership, 136 titles, series, or loose-leaf services, 29 State publications, and 10 city or area publications were mentioned. Twenty-four libraries said that as a depository library, the library received most of the publications of the U.S. Department of Labor. Those titles that were listed by five or more libraries are listed below with the number of libraries listed in the left hand column that designated owning them.

LABOR COLLECTION INFORMATION

No. of libraries listing item	Title, Publisher, Editor, etc. of item
26	Monthly Labor Review, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
15	Labor Law Guide (weekly loose-leaf updates) 2 loose-leaf vols. Commerce Clearing House
15	*Labor Relations Guide,* Prentice-Hall
12	*Personnel Management Section* (Policy & Practice Series). Bureau of National Affairs
10	*Directory of National Unions and Employee Associations, 1973* (subscription service). U.S. Department of Labor

LIBRARIES WITH SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

	LABOR COLLECTION					**PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME EXPENDED**	
Name of Library	**No. of Books**	**No. of Newspaper/ Journal Titles**	**No. of Micro-Materials**	**No. of Pamphlets**	**Is specific space designated for the Labor Collection?**	**Public service hours**	**Collection development hours**
Ardmore P.L., OK	60	10	0	225	N.A.	0-10 hrs./month	0-10 hrs./month
Brooklyn P.L., NY	8,000	1,050	20,000	650	No	Over 30 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Brown Co. Lib. Green Bay, WI	85	30	0	125	No	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Buffalo & Erie Co. P.L., NY	100	N.A.	0	50-60	No	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Carlsbad P.L., NM	50	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Yes	N.A.	N.A.
Dallas P.L., TX	1,500	25	N.A.	250	No	Over 30 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Detroit P.L., MI	15,000	230	850	13,000	No	11-30 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Hartford P.L., WI	40-60	2	0	N.A.	No	N.A.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Lee-Itawabana Regional Lib. Tupelo, MS	70/labor 600/bus.	N.A.	N.A.	14	No	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.

N.A. = No Answer

10	*Bulletin #177* (rev.) 1974, U.S. Dept. of Labor. Employment Standard Administration. Division of State Employment Standards: Labor offices in the United States and Canada
9	*Employment Practices Guide* (2 loose-leaf reports per month). 3 loose-leaf vols. Commerce Clearing House
9	*Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1975.* Commerce Clearing House
5	*Collective Bargaining Negotiations and Contracts* (loose-leaf service, weekly update). Bureau of National Affairs.
5	*Directory of National and International Labor Unions in the United States.* U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

LIBRARIES WITH SPECIAL COLLECTIONS (cont.)

	LABOR COLLECTION					PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME EXPENDED	
Name of Library	**No. of Books**	**No. of Newspaper/ Journal Titles**	**No. of Micro-Materials**	**No. of Pamphlets**	**Is specific space designated for the Labor Collection?**	**Public service hours**	**Collection development hours**
New Castle Free P.L., PA	450	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Yes	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
New York P.L., NY	60,000	Cannot be determined			No	Over 30 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Montgomery Co.-Norristown P.L., PA	1,750 approx.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	No[5]	N.A.	N.A.
Paducah P.L., KY	166	9	N.A.	N.A.	Yes	No set hours	No set hours
Princeton P.L., WV	37	3	N.A.	1,000 approx.	Yes	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Richland Co. P.L. Columbia, SC	130	5	0	52	No	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Scranton P.L., PA	400 approx.	16	0	150 approx.	Yes	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.
Veterans Mem. P.L. Bismark, ND	35-40	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Public Lib. of Youngstown & Mahoning Co. Youngstown, OH	1,070	10	N.A.	3 file drawers	No	0-10 hrs./wk.	0-10 hrs./wk.

5	Employment and Earnings (periodically). U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
5	*Employment Safety and Health Guide* (weekly loose-leaf updates). 3 loose-leaf vols. Commerce Clearing House
5	*1976 Guidebook to Labor Relations* (#5449) 392 pages, paperback, $8.50. Commerce Clearing House
5	*Labor Arbitration* (section of the Labor Relations Reporter Service). Bureau of National Affairs
5	*The Labor Reference Book.* Paradis, Adrian A., Editor, 1972, Chilton
5	*Occupational Outlook Quarterly.* U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
5	*Occupational Safety and Health Reporter* (loose-leaf service, weekly update). Bureau of National Affairs
5	*Occupational Safety and Health,* 1972 (5 volumes). U.S. Department of Labor. Occupational and Health Administration
5	*Pension Plan Guide* (weekly loose-leaf updates). 2 loose-leaf vols. plus 1 additional volume on Plans and Clauses. Commerce Clearing House
5	*Union Labor Report* (loose-leaf service, weekly update). Bureau of National Affairs
5	*Wages, Hours—Federal and State Section* (Policy and Practice Series). Bureau of National Affairs

One hundred fifty-four additional titles were also listed one to five times.

The committee wanted to identify any possible trends in future services, so we asked the question, "If no service exists now, are there any planned in the near future?" Only 17 libraries responded yes. Of those that did respond affirmatively, the answers varied. The responses were mainly in the area of collection development including: 1) plans to add materials about local industries; 2) plans to add reference materials; 3) proposed expansion of local history collection in the labor area; 4) development of a permanent collection and display of materials for labor which would include occupation selection and training; 5) creation of a permanent display of materials for all adults who want to improve their reading ability; and 6) plans to add a job information center. Several respondents mentioned having difficulty locating labor materials.

Other comments on the libraries' plans regarding future service to labor groups included: 1) the type of service planned in the future will depend on analysis of response to queries of labor people; 2) several libraries mentioned they would welcome help in planning for new library buildings from labor; 3) plans to publish booklists; 4) the possibility of housing the local's labor collections in the library; and 5) plans to continue talking with labor union representatives and encouraging their requests. Several respondents said they would like to provide some type of service after realizing how little they now offer, but did not specify what type of service.

The libraries who discussed why they did not plan any future service said mostly that there was little or no demand, or maybe they would plan something at a later date. Remembering that the committee only sent the questionnaires to those libraries in cities of 10,000 having central labor councils, many responses to this question were surprising. If a library answered this question no, indicating that they did not plan a service to labor groups in the near future, there was no space provided on the questionnaire to comment on that negative response. However, many respondents felt the necessity of justifying their answer and wrote additional comments. Among those comments were: "labor not highly unionized here," "low interest area," and "Do we have any unions in Huron, S.D.?" Others responding negatively cited lack of staff, lack of room, and budget limitations.

When queried, "Has the library approached the central labor body or local unions to offer library services to them or to secure suggestions for needed library services?" only 45, or 11.6 percent, said they had. Of these, in almost every case, the approach was limited to a single time. A single time approach is indicative of the low motivation and concern for the dispensing of possible service to labor, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the fact that only 11.6 percent made any contact at all; 88.4 percent indicated they had not talked with any representative from a labor council or union. In the 1967 survey, 156 (40.6 percent) libraries stated that they had contact with the labor unions in their community. This represents a 29 percent drop in library contact with union groups over a nine-year period.

The committee wanted to identify the libraries in which a staff member was assigned to work with labor organizations and/or labor-related materials. Fourteen libraries identified such a staff member, but the duties and the time that the person devoted to labor-related activities varied greatly. The 1967 survey identified 22 libraries with a specific staff member assigned to work with labor organizations.

Information on libraries outlined below indicates some of the information written in response to the question: "Is there a staff member assigned to work with labor organizations and/or labor-related materials? If so, would you describe the staff member's job responsibilities."

To give the committee direction as to what kind and/or type of material it should develop in the future, the question, "Have you utilized previously any materials published by the AFL/CIO-ALA (RASD) Joint Committee on Library Services to Labor Groups?" was asked. Twenty-five (6.4 percent) answered that they had, while 360 (93.6 percent) answered no. The respondents indicated that *Library Services to Labor Newsletter* published as part of the Adult Services Newsletter which ceased publication in 1970 because of ALA budget difficulties was the publication most heavily used. Only seven libraries said they had used the pamphlet *Library Services to Labor Groups—A Guide to Action,* a 1975 publication. Perhaps smaller libraries or those not surveyed use the publication more extensively.

Since the Joint Committee has a dual responsibility to both the AFL/CIO and ALA, the survey included a question to determine what the librarian viewed as types of cooperation from labor organizations that would be useful and/or desirable if the library wished to establish a special collection or special services to labor unions. This question received more responses than any other question. This is indicative of the fact that most libraries were more interested in what labor could do for them than in what they could do for labor (177 libraries wanted advice or cooperation of some type from the union, yet only 45 libraries had even approached the union or central labor council even once, and 88.4 percent had never approached them). The authors grouped the type of cooperation desired into four general areas: 1) support, 2) advice and consultation, 3) coordination and communication, and 4) other. Many libraries listed suggestions in several of the categories. Twenty-seven respondents, the largest response group, wanted consultation or advice from the union on materials to be purchased for the library.

The main types of support desired by libraries from unions were: 1) financial support from unions for special materials, staff or services (with low local union budgets, this is rather unrealistic); 2) support, both financial and individual, for the library's building program; and 3) donations of books, materials, and special staff time.

Libraries stated that four different types of advice and consultation would be useful and/or desirable. Consultation and/or advice from the union on material purchases, including specific subjects needed and advice about services was mentioned by 120 (32 percent) libraries. This is surprising in that it is traditionally thought of as the professional librarian's role to be the only one capable of doing material selection. A very few libraries indicated they would like labor representatives on their book selection committees. Some said they would find it helpful to have union members evaluate the existing library collection. Only two libraries indicated that they wanted information for the library on unionization.

Various types of ways the union could provide coordination and facilitate communication were suggested. Twenty-seven libraries wanted a liaison committee with the union, a regular time to meet with the union education committee or union members to attend library board meetings.

It is interesting to speculate on how the following suggestions would be implemented since only 45 libraries indicated in response to an earlier question that they had approached central labor bodies or local unions to offer library services or to secure suggestions for needed library services. The suggestions given about what assistance from labor unions and/or councils would be desirable included:

No. of libraries mentioning item	Suggestion
23	Publicity assistance for the library to union members
22	Bibliographies prepared by unions
14	Use and encourage use of library collection by union headquarters
12	(No interest shown by union or did not want union assistance)
10	Meeting time with union to discuss library resources
7	Library placed on union mailing lists
6	Deposit of union materials in the library
2	Cooperation in buying of materials
2	Space for deposit of library collection in union headquarters

Again, it is interesting to note that 22 libraries wanted unions to prepare bibliographies containing books and materials the labor union would want. This is usually in the job description of the professional librarian. These libraries said that they wanted the union to actually prepare the bibliographies as opposed to the libraries mentioned previously who desired assistance, consultation, or advice in preparing booklists and in selecting materials.

Some librarians indicated again that their library is moving toward a unified collection and away from any subject specialties. And, again, many said in response to this question, that unions are not well organized in their area. Librarians in rural areas seemed particularly unaware of the existence of unions. Several would only be willing to provide services to labor groups if they were firmly convinced of the union need. They indicated that they were currently not convinced a need existed. Often, if librarians showed a willingness to purchase materials for labor, they stated they would only do so if the union paid for the materials. This mood is summarized by a librarian who said, "We need to know what they need; we also need to have some indication that the materials will be *used.* The truth is, if people had been coming in asking for labor services we would have had them by now."

Many statements indicated the librarian's mistrust of unions. One librarian stated ". . . unions will ruin the United States. This library does not wish to assist in our country's downfall." Mistrust was also illustrated by one comment in particular, although it was echoed in many others, "Ask members to check them (books) out, not steal them." Also, it was assumed that persons in a labor union had reading problems and several libraries suggested purchasing high-interest, low-vocabulary or even literacy materials for union membership use. Others indicated it would not be worth their while to provide specialized materials since union members wouldn't use them anyway.

LIBRARIES WITH STAFF ASSIGNED TO LABOR-RELATED ACTIVITIES[6]

Name of Library	**Ordering Materials in Subject Area**	**Special Promotion of Labor Materials**	**Review Books in Area**	**Subject Reference**	**Job Title**
Chicago P.L., IL	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.
P.L. of Cincinnati and Manilton Co., OH	Yes	N.I.	Yes	N.I.	N.I.
Detroit P.L., MI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N.I.
Fitchburg P.L., MA	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	Reference Librarian
Greensboro P.L., NC	Yes	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	Business Librarian
Lee-Itawamba Reg. Lib. Tupelo, MS	Yes	Yes	N.I.	Yes	Reference Librarian
Mid-Manhattan Lib. Branch of NY P.L.	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.
Mitchell P.L., SD	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	Reference Librarian
Morris County Free Lib. Wippany, NJ	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.
New York P.L., N.Y.	Yes	N.I.	Yes	Yes	Special Librarian; Labor and Industrial Relations
Princeton P.L., WV	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.
San Jose P.L., CA	Yes	N.I.	Yes	Yes	Librarian II
St. Louis P.L., MO	Yes	N.I.	N.I.	Yes	N.I.
Scranton P.L., PA[7]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Special Info. Serv. Libn. Govt; Business & Labor

---

[6] *Of the libraries with staff assigned to labor-related activities, only five of them also indicated they had a special collection and are listed also on chart on pages 7 and 8.*

[7] *Also, attends meetings of labor organizations and information seminars and symposiums to increase knowledge in area and to meet labor leaders, prepare bibliographies in area, etc.*

N.I. = Not Indicated

Conclusion: Some of the most significant findings of the survey were the following: 1) Since 1967, the number of special labor collections, the number of staff with labor service related job assignments, the number of libraries working with labor organizations, and the amount of interest in providing service to labor organizations and/or their membership has steadily declined. I do feel that in some part this is due to the overall decline in many libraries of special, separate collections. But, I also think that the written unsolicited comments on the questionnaire indicate that labor is not

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—DIVISION INFORMATION ON LABOR MATERIALS AND SERVICES

Name of Division	Number of Labor-Related Titles	Special Services for Labor Unions and/or Membership	Cooperation that would be useful from Labor Organization
Archive of Folk Song-Music Div.	25,000 pp. MS 25,000 songs 50 books 20 periodicals	Certain LP's Bibliographies on labor subjects	Acquire recordings or texts which document occupational folklore or history of labor movement
Cartoons	Have no idea		Trained searcher to prepare bibliography of labor-related cartoons
General Reference and Bibliography	95,000 est.		
Manuscript Div.	300,000 est.	20th century specialist provides reference service & acquires new collections	Retirement of records to LC Funding for organization of records
Motion Pictures	228 including films from Americans at Work series		
Music Reading Room-Music Div.	150 vols. also Labor songs		
Orientalia	4,300 est.		
Photography	Impossible to judge		
Posters	40-50 posters est.		To submit any or all posters to LC for their permanent collection
Rare Book & Special Collections Div.	No current materials in this area		
Recorded Sound Section-Music Div.	Cannot estimate		
Slavic & Central European Div.	Books, periodicals & newspapers on labor unions & all other fields of labor; Number impossible to estimate	Provide frequent ref. serv. to labor organizations & scholars specializing in labor field	

seen as a group with special needs. Many librarians indicated they had shifted the emphasis of their service to special business collections; 2) There was a surprising amount of mistrust and lack of understanding of anything connected with unions shown by the librarians answering the questionnaire. Also, many librarians indicated that the service wasn't necessary or would not be used, even though only 45 of the 385 respondents had even approached the labor organization to ask them. Repeated lack of awareness that unions existed in their areas was also evident; 3) Of the librarians that did say they wanted to provide service to labor groups, many stated that they had received no cooperation from the union. Several mentioned that they had discontinued special services due to lack of interest or lack of cooperation from the labor organization.

The committee will use the information collected to develop materials to help libraries that would like to improve, expand or organize a collection of materials to be used by labor groups. Also, information will be provided outlining special programs that could be developed. The committee plans to obtain in-depth information from the libraries with significant special collections. This brief state of the art of library service to labor groups presents the current picture.

---

[1] Library Service to Labor, *compiled by Dorothy Kuhn Oko and Bernard F. Downey, Scarecrow Press, 1963.*

[2] *I would like to note that since December 1955 the AFL and the CIO have merged into the AFL/CIO and the emphasis of activities in the book of separate organizations reflect premerger conditions.*

[3] *The results of the 1967 survey and additional information about the survey are available from the Chairperson of the AFL/CIO-ALA (RASD) Joint Committee on Library Services to Labor Groups.*

[4] *Pretest was sent to the following public libraries: Akron, OH; Brooklyn, NY; Miami, FL; Denver, CO; Atlanta, GA; Oakland, CA; Boston, MA; St. Louis, MO; Galveston, TX; and Seattle, WA.*

[5] *Would shelve collection separately, but lack of space prevents doing so.*

Questionnaire

1. Labor Collections

   a. Does the library system have a special collection of materials for use by labor unions and/or organizations?

   yes ________ no ________

   If no, please disregard b, c and d and *answer question e.*

   b. What is included in this collection?

   Number of books ________

   Number of newspapers/journal titles ________

Number of pamphlets ________

Number of micromaterials ________

c. Is space specifically designated for the labor collection?

yes ________ no ________

d. How much professional staff time is allocated to servicing this collection? ____________

Public service hours:
  0-10 hours/week ________
  11-30 hours/week ________
  Over 30 hours/week ________

Collection development hours:
  0-10 hours/week ________
  Over 10 hours/week ________

For those responding "no" to question a:

e. Provide a rough estimate of the number of titles in the library's collection that represent labor-related materials ____________

2. Please list any special services that now exist from your library for labor unions and/or their membership. For example,

1. Labor Press Directory—1st ed., 1957—
   Washington, International Labor Press Association
2. Bureau of National Affairs
   Daily Labor Reports, Washington
3. U.S. Department of Labor.
   Employment Standards Administration. Division of State Employment Standards; Labor Offices in the United States and Canada. Bulletin 177 (rev.) 1974

(Use the back side of this page for listing these services)

3. If no special services exist now, are any planned in the near future?

yes ________ no ________

If yes, what type of services are planned?

4. Has the library approached the central labor body or local unions to offer library services to them or to secure suggestions for needed library services?

yes ________ no ________

5. Is there a staff member assigned to work with labor organizations and/or labor-related materials?

yes ________ no ________

If so, would you describe the staff member's job responsibilities:

6. Have you utilized previously any materials (Library Service to Labor Groups—A Guide to Action, 1975; Your Library Can Serve Your Union, 1962; or Library Services to Labor Newsletter), published by the AFL/CIO Joint Committee on Library Service to Labor Groups?

yes _______ no _______

If yes, which did you find most useful?

7. If the library wished to establish a special collection or special services for labor unions, what cooperation from labor organizations would be useful and/or desirable?

Dorothy Shields
AFL-CIO

Testimony Submitted by Jule Shipman

I am Jule Shipman, president of the Pennsylvania Citizens for Better Libraries and a member of the Pennsylvania delegation to the White House Conference. I have been asked by our delegation to present the attached resolution which the delegation approved on October 17, 1979, for submission to the Conference.

This resolution is the culmination of increasing concern of Pennsylvanians over the issue of library and information service support. From the centers of our major cities to the sparsely populated expanse of the countryside, we hear the same appeal: "Give us the services we most need to help us help ourselves. Keep our libraries open; don't close them just when we most need them."

The common voice of 600 Pennsylvanians at our Governor's Conference accordingly placed first priority on this issue. The first order of business of our duly elected delegation was to create a statewide library Friends group to carry this issue to the State Capitol.

And so we viewed with increasing concern the literature coming to us on Conference preparations that ambitiously dealt with substantive questions of library programs and technology, but lost sight of the most significant challenge to libraries of this century; that is, their place in funding priorities of a society beset by inflation and a retrenching economy.

Also, without positive focus on funding, and leaving the structure of Conference follow-up presumably to the chance of ad hoc attention at the Conference itself, we deeply feared a rudderless ship of high intentions failing to reach any port of achievement.

We thus welcomed the initiative of the Kennedy-Javits bill as a framework for productive discussion. We recognized it as a study bill; not as an accepted formula, but as a vehicle for development of organized solutions to the pressing problem of future library and information service support.

We further welcomed Maryland's invitation to each of the 57 WHCLIS delegations to caucus this week on Conference follow-through. It is clear that a national oversight committee representative of the Conference is absolutely essential if we are to carry the spirit of the Conference effectively into the future provision of national library legislation or any other important implementation of Conference principles.

So in the excitement of Conference dialogue on its admittedly vital themes, the Pennsylvania delegation offers the resolution with the hope that the Conference will formally adopt it as an affirmation of practical need.

Library and information service programs need a home. The home needs a foundation. The foundation needs a builder. They all need maintenance. As we dream for the future, let's not forget the mechanics of how to realize those dreams.

ADDENDUM:

Proposed Resolution

Be it resolved: 1) that the White House Conference recognize the urgent need for a reordering of local, State, and Federal priorities to respond to the increasing need for excellence and wide use of library and information services; 2) that such reordering must result in improved funding for all types of nonprofit library and information services with significantly heavier shares borne by State and Federal governments; 3) that study bill S.1124 be developed into a strong National Library Act giving impetus and sustenance to this reordering of priorities and reallocation of resources and providing substantial response to the major specific library and information service needs which may be subject to Federal intervention; and 4) that a structure of responsibility be confirmed by the White House Conference for effective follow-through with this development.

Approved by the Pennsylvania
WHC Delegation, October 17,
1979

Jule Shipman
Pennsylvania Delegation to WHCLIS

Testimony Submitted by John Smith

The Library Needs of the Deaf

Hearing-impaired people constitute 11.5 percent of the population of the United States. Of these, at least 200,000 "have a very severe-to-total break in normal communication channels" (*Law & The Deaf,* Lowell J. Meyers, p. 3). These people are an invisible population. Because of the barrier of communication between libraries and the deaf, the diverse needs of the deaf have gone unmet.

The greatest problem has been a misunderstanding that print materials can serve the deaf. Print materials are based upon phonetic symbols which are seldom adequately understood by the profoundly deaf. Another problem has been the general attitude toward American Sign Language (ASL). It has been scorned and vilified historically by hearing people as an inferior language, and only recently, has become a source of deaf pride and respect. A new understanding is developing that sign language is a "natural first language" based upon visual symbols rather than aural symbols. This is essentially true for the 10 percent of deaf children whose parents are deaf and can learn language and cultural skills from them. However, the mejority of deaf people, born to hearing parents, suffer a lack of language development and are blocked from learning social and cultural skills until they encounter other deaf students in school where sign language is used.

Appropriate library services are also lacking for other hearing-impaired citizens who, together, comprise the majority of the hearing impaired: those whose hearing decreases with age, those who become deaf after the acquisition of spoken language, and those who are partially deaf or hard-of-hearing.

While many pre- and post-lingually deaf rely on ASL, hundreds of thousands of others operate orally, depending upon lip-reading and speech. Significant variations occur, however. Many deaf people converse in both ASL and written English, but not speech. Others including the foreign-born and those who have not had adequate education, may be minimal language users.

In their struggle to become part of the American mainstream, the deaf have become heir to significant technological breakthroughs. Teletypewriters, compatible with the telephone, now provide the deaf with an important form of communication access. Videotapes, whether captioned or produced in ASL, are also becoming a means of access for the deaf.

To serve the deaf community best, libraries, especially those in large urban areas, need to install teletype machines and train people how to use them. These devices can provide the necessary access for the deaf to enter into the developing network of information services being developed by libraries.

A national program similar to the "Talking Books for the Blind" program administered by the Library of Congress should be developed for the deaf and hearing-impaired. Emphasis should be upon the availability of low-cost, efficient videotape equipment. A videotape section in the central libraries could serve as a resource of the visual culture of the deaf. Since ASL has no easily interpreted written form, videotape technology availability in the library is essential. Videotapes could also provide information on deafness, sign language study, careers for the deaf, and deaf arts. Videotape production would also add the dimension of being able to generate and share new information about deaf society.

Libraries amenable to such services should hire deaf staff and personnel trained in ASL. While seemingly separatist in notion, experience has shown that deaf library services and other handicapped library services should be separated. This is due to a difference in language and culture which make it difficult for people serving other disabilities to understand the needs and services of the deaf. It has been proved that a deaf employee will maximize outreach to the deaf community and reverse the myth of library inaccessibility. There is a great need for affirmative action programs for the deaf in the nation's library schools. Until then, libraries should consider hiring deaf assistants and para-professionals who can aid librarians in reaching out to the deaf community.

Interpreter services should also be budgeted for in-service training of deaf employees and providing deaf access to library events and programs.

Finally, in any evaluation of library services aimed at the deaf, there must be deaf participation, giving the deaf patron a "voice" in the services being provided. A deaf person would best be able to assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of any library program aimed at that community.

This statement has been prepared by Hank Berman, Catholic Social Services; Roberto Esteves, Director, SFPL Communications Center; John Smith, Deaf Services Specialist, SFPL (Delegate); with special thanks to Alice L. Hagemeyer, MLS (Delegate).

John Smith
Coordinating Committee for the Deaf

Testimony Submitted by Theodore Soo-Hoo

I speak from experience with the public library system of Washington, D.C., but I believe that the two fundamental problems that I mention probably exist in many other systems in the country.

The first gap that I worry about is right at the beginning. People do not recognize the importance of continuing to develop their reading skill after finishing their formal education. They need to be reminded continually that selective reading is good for them, even if they are Ph.D.s. The Tenley Library Council, a Friends of the Library organization, has developed a series of posters for our "Read

Your Way Up" program. We are changing them biweekly. A typical poster is worded approximately as follows: "James Gavin, grade school dropout, joined the Army. At the army post library, he taught himself enough to pass the exams for West Point. He rose to the rank of Lieutenant General. When he retired, he became head of a leading research organization." Another poster, now on the library bulletin board, says, "One man in the audience said that, in spite of six years of college, he had learned more at the public library than in all his years of formal schooling." We plan to add to the series of posters as we find more testimonies to the benefits of reading for everyone. The posters are hand-lettered and cost practically nothing. If a more effective method of promoting and encouraging reading is developed, we would like to know about it.

The second gap that we worry about is in access. Due to budget limitations, 16 of Washington's 20 branch libraries are open only 40 hours per week. In summer they are closed on Saturday, leaving only two evenings per week that they are accessible to people who work in the daytime. Contrast this with the following comment from the vice president of our Library Council, Mr. McNeil, who travels over the world to evaluate book events for the U.S. Information Agency, "The Centre de George Pompidou, in Paris. I spent some October time there and rate it the finest public library I have ever seen. Would you believe 12 noon to 10 p.m. every weekday, except Tuesday (closed Tuesdays), and 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday? Those are hours! They also have a bookstore and print shop inside, and separate whole collection rooms in which to hear records, watch VTRs, films and slide shows. It's free even to foreigners, but of course it helps to read French."

What can the National Commission do about such mundane problems? You can encourage and promote continuing, aggressive programs to encourage reading at all levels, within and beyond our educational systems. You can encourage all libraries to review their accessibility to the public in imaginative ways.

Theodore Soo-Hoo
Tenley Library Council

Testimony Submitted by Gilbert Sprauve

Viewed from a contemporary perspective, the Virgin Islands, my home, constitute an anachronism. First, there is the contention between the unique historical significance of these islands and the increasingly sleazy tourist image attached to them. Second, the Islands are often viewed by their peers within the sea of West Indian Islands as being only marginally West Indian. Third, there has to be reconciled the image of a bubbling commercial oasis within the larger Caribbean Seas of desperation and misery.

Information exchange, the theme of my presentation, is an ongoing process in our society. One has only to visit our carnival and

638

to listen to our calypsonians—veritable relics of the West African *griots*—as they peddle their exciting versions of the latest happenings in high and low places of the Caribbean, to be convinced of this fact. Or, on your next visit to our Islands, you might try eavesdropping on the work crew restoring telephone service to your hotel and securing for yourself a crash course in the bread and butter issues of our region—in four or five different dialects or patois. Meanwhile, in the documents section of our library, an understaffed crew is exerting its best efforts to cope with the information explosion of our times within the space and equipment constraints of a long past era.

Time wili not permit me to elaborate here on what could, in any case, appear to be some parochial aspects of the larger information exchange issue. I have selected the above examples by way of dramatizing aspects of the anchoronism that is the Virgin Islands today, and with the intent of paving the way to the dynamic solution I shall propose for dealing with the problem. (In the end I hope it will be evident that the Virgin Islands is a microcosm of the larger issues before us, and an adequate response here will be a timely model for national planners in the near future.)

In my years of living in West Africa, I was always impressed by one manifestation of United States foreign policy. That was the early establishment of U.S.I.S. libraries which, to me, constituted veritable bridgeheads against the tyranny of ignorance. Many of my students were regular users of these facilities. I believe their lives were immensely enriched by this contact.

As I address the situation in the Virgin Islands today, the most appropriate symbol of Americanism is probably the bulldozer. Ours is a society which has been infected and affected by one of the most massive attacks of the progress virus ever visited on any society in recent times. Everybody comes to the Virgin Islands, and in the continuous feast it seems as though everybody leaves some junk with us and pillages what he can get—be it a gracious smile from a senior citizen or a brain coral from our shrinking reefs—for his departure.

Again, because the Virgin Islands is a place where people come and go—to and from all corners of the world—in terms of information exchange, there should be a richness in this type of commerce. A richness that befits our position as the flagship of Amrican affluence. What is enigmatic is that this ship sails in the midst of a hungry and desperate Caribbean Sea of mini-states. To the extent that the Virgin Islands are sapped culturally and rendered hungry for a meaningful existence by this hollow, one-track commercial upheaval, we become vulnerable to the scrutiny, contempt, and (Yes!) envy of our ethnic brothers and neighbors in the Caribbean.

Overriding the anachronism of the Virgin Islands is the fact that we stand at the gateway to the Caribbean. This position constitutes our final vulnerability. When one reads between the lines, what is being sketched here may be seen as a portrait of impending disaster.

it does not have to be. The principal recommendation I humbly offer for your consideration is intended not only to contain this disaster, or to redress the rape of the Virgin Islands. If implemented promptly and judiciously, and with the proper local involvement, I am convinced it will constitute a model for the construction of global bridgehead against the tyranny of ignorance that we noted earlier.

I propose that there be established, through joint Federal and local government participation, if necessary, on the Virgin Islands, a model center for international information exchange. The ideological basis for such a proposal, I believe, is self-evident. There are, in addition, a number of practical considerations. Information exchange is, in fact, an ongoing process within current library and information services in the Virgin Islands. The tactical position of the Virgin Islands within the Caribbean—and in the world—is such that exchange would operate even with only a nominal commitment from the top and totally inadequate funding. The exchange that now takes place is often effected through extra-curricular efforts of librarians, who generously dispatch material to each other on a person-to-person basis. Such interchange is probably most intense during the course of regional conferences and workshops. The obstacles are formidable. Among them are: differences in fiscal practices among regional governments, cost of shipping where bulk rates are nonexistent, and communication problems.

I propose that there be established and erected on a choice location in the Virgin Islands a great center for international information exchange. Such a center will not only respond to the obvious strategic needs for survival of a way of life, it will also stand proud and preeminent on the horizon of the Caribbean as an emblem of this Nation's commitment to the rehumanizing of a historically strong, but recently desperate, people.

This international information exchange center, that I propose, will have three primary functions: a) to serve as a regional network facilitator; b) to be an adjunct to the Library of Congress in our area; and c) to serve as a clearinghouse.

Finally, the blueprint for such a center will have global applicability for those who must chart the course of this Nation's survival and recovery. Such a center tomorrow, in the place of one of those U.S.I.S. libraries of two decades ago on the West Coast of Africa, would signal a timely and appropriate new thrust in the foreign policy of this nation.

Gilbert S. Sprauve

Testimony Submitted by Margaret Stern

I bring you greetings from the members of the various Library Users' Associations of New York City, who hope and trust that, after preliminary preparations of 22 years, this conference will reach conclusions and legislative recommendations that will bring benefits to the many neighborhood branch libraries of our 50 States and 6 territories. *It is high time.*

May I cite two quotations: Cicero called the library the "soul" of his house; and Pope John Paul II, in his farewell address to New York City, stated, "Above all, a city needs a soul if it is to become a true home for human beings." It is my sincere hope that this important conference will devote itself to the means of nurturing this "soul."

Interbranch Library Users' Association of New York City is an umbrella group for all branch library users' organizations of the city. And in one way, New York City's branch libraries are unique. The New York Public Library (the research libraries at 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue, financed by funds from the Astor, Lenox and Tilden foundations and supplemented by private gifts) is the administrator of 82 branch libraries in Manhattan, the Bronx, and Staten Island. This is by contract with the city under its agreement with Andrew Carnegie at the time he donated funds for 50 branch libraries in the city. The city now supplies approximately 82 percent of the financing of these 82 branches plus 3 bookmobiles, the State 15 percent, and the Federal government 5 percent. The library systems of Brooklyn and Queens are independent organizations with their own boards of trustees and financed at about the same rate as the branches of the New York Public Library.

I am head of Interbranch Library Users' Association, as well as a member of both the Branch Libraries Council of the New York Public Library and the Five-Borough Library Users' Organization. This Five-Borough group cooperates in keeping our legislators informed about the sadly depleted state of the branch libraries and the library needs of the users in the various parts of the city. Together, we have exerted enough pressure on the city government to rescind the proposed library budget cuts for Fiscal 1980 and to have the Board of Estimate override the Mayor's veto. Our voice has been heard in past years, too, and we have proven that *"we can fight City Hall."*

This paper is the result of discussions with individual library users and librarians throughout the five boroughs. So, in a sense, I speak for the almost eight million citizens of the city and the hundreds of thousands of commuters from the suburbs who use our neighborhood libraries.

Each neighborhood of the city has its own special needs and its own characteristics. And these are shifting constantly, with shifts in population. When the 1980 Census is completed and analyzed, it will become apparent how wide these shifts are. Meanwhile, it is encumbent on librarians of the local branches to be alert to these shifting needs.

For example, areas formerly predominantly Jewish in population now have large numbers of Spanish-language residents. It is therefore important that readers are supplied with these urgently needed Spanish-language books. Other sections of the city now have a large Chinese population—older people who need to learn English and children who need books for both school and pleasure. There are other shifts as well, such as areas with large groups of senior citizens with their special needs.

Within the library system as a whole, there are books in 74 foreign languages, 50 of these for children and young adults. And now there is need for more books in various Asian languages. In addition, some areas of the city are subjected to serious problems of vandalism. It is felt by users that better hours of service would cut down on this vandalism. And that more children's and young adult services are urgently needed. Not just entertainment, but book-oriented programs, with books on display on the topics discussed and offered for circulation. After all, the basic purpose of a library is to make information through books and other media available to take home and enjoy, to get the feel of the printed words on clean, white paper, to help people experience the unique pleasures of reading.

There are also sections of the city where finished but unopened libraries exist because of the lack of staff. This is a detriment to the community. Buildings are deteriorating badly and capital funds are required to rehabilitate them. In fact, the problems of the five boroughs proliferate. And under existing Federal law, access to public buildings for the physically handicapped must be made available. This, alone, requires hundreds of thousands of dollars which must and should come from Federal funds.

Our problems come down to one simple requirement: money, money, money. Money for more books, money for better and more convenient hours of service, money for clerks (formerly paid by CETA funds) to carry out the essential clerical services so important to a well-functioning library. Especially, money for trained library staff—people who are trained to understand the needs of library users, who, when a special book is unavailable, can suggest alternatives, who can encourage children and young adults and help instill in them a love of books. And, above all, libraries—like our national forests—must remain *forever free*.

We want a policy that will stress essentials: to help develop a book-oriented public, a public that can understand what is happening in today's changing world and can tell our legislators what they want and need.

The branch libraries of Manhattan, the Bronx, and Staten Island serve a population of approximately 3.375 million people who took out 9,164,156 books and other material last year—an increase of 136,500 over 1977-78. But currently, our libraries are 31.3 percent below minimum state standards, while in 1978 they were only 24.9 percent below. With the loss of CETA workers, things are getting steadily worse. At the height of the late depression, the public libraries of New York City were open from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. six days a week. *Where have our priorities gone astray?*

We need a happy balance between special projects and essential services. The main purpose of the neighborhood library is to encourage book circulation and reading. As Milton said, "A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit." A book can be the best of friends. Special projects often divert money that should be used for trained librarians and more and more books, as well as for better hours.

The burden of funding for local libraries rests too heavily on our hard-pressed cities. It is time for both the Federal Government and the States to assume a greater share of the burden. This, I assume, is one of the chief purposes of this Conference. We need a simplification of the process of funding—from Federal to State to local libraries.

In closing, let me quote President Carter from his position paper on libraries, prior to the election, "If we are to have an educated and informed population, we need a strong and open library system supported by a committed Administration. We cannot call for a revival of quality education and close our libraries. We cannot ask our children to learn to read and take away their books."

Margaret Stern
Interbranch Library Users
Association

Testimony Submitted
by Robert D. Stueart

Citizen Information Seeking Patterns:
A New England Study

by Ching-chih Chen, Principal Investigator, Peter Hernon,
Peter A. Neenan, and Robert D. Stueart

School of Library Science, Simmons College, Boston

This study was sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, Office of Libraries & Learning Resources Title II-B, Library Research and Demonstration Grant.

This document speaks to the role of libraries in satisfying the informational, recreational, occupational, and educational desires of our citizens. Many persons and agencies are participating in the projects of which this summary report is a first word provided for the White House Conference.

State librarians, community librarians, school librarians, academic librarians, college students, and researchers are helping, but most important of all is the direct involvement of the citizens of the six New England states. It is they who ultimately will shape the future of library and information services and whose support it must possess. The Office of Libraries and Learning Resources is pleased to join the School of Library Science of Simmons College in this venture into the future of knowledge.

Dick W. Hays
Associate Commissioner
Office of Libraries and Learning Resources
Office of Education

Introduction: This report, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, highlights findings of a survey into the everyday information needs of New England residents. These information needs relate to occupational and non-occupational situations in which residents made decisions, sought answers, or clarified or solved problems. As a result of this probing of individuals' situations, the data from this survey provide insights into the behavior of information seekers (e.g., their source awareness and problem articulation), source providers consulted, perceived level of satisfaction with information source providers, institutional and environmental barriers to effective information seeking, and reasons for use and non-use of libraries.

The six New England States vary greatly in terms of residential situs (urban/rural), socio-economic status (age, education, and income), and availability of information sources (interpersonal, institutional, and mass media). By providing insights into a variety of information situations information-seeking strategies, and barriers encountered in the search for information, a study of New England has relevance for other parts of the United States.

This study is the first to examine information needs of adult citizens (16 years and older) on a regional or multistate scale. It places library use, for the region as a whole, in the context of specific situations and details a range of other sources consulted in the search for information.

During the months from July to October, 1979, individuals from 2,400 households in New England, 400 per State to simplify cross-State comparisons, submitted to telephone interviews averaging 15 minutes. These interviews probed both work and non-work situations and asked about problems needing solutions that individuals had encountered in the past month or so. Households were selected on the basis of a computer-generated, random sample of New England telephone numbers. Comparison with demographic data compiled by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for the region suggests that those interviewed were representative of demographic characteristics for individual States and for the region. The 2,400 New England residents interviewed fall into the following categories: *Sex:* Female, 55.4%; Male, 44.6%. *Ethnic:* White, 93.8%; Black, 1.7%; American Indian, 1.2%; Portuguese, 0.9%; Hispanic, 0.6%; Asian American, 0.2%; Other, 1.6%.

For the purpose of analysis, data were analyzed on the basis of frequency distributions and percentages as well as tests for significance of relationships between variables. Specific questions were examined on the basis of the following demographics: sex, age, geographic location (urban/rural), education, occupation, income, and ethnic background. This summary report highlights significant findings of this investigation, detailed analysis of which will be presented in the forthcoming report.

In summary, it is the belief of the researchers that the base-line data generated from this regional study will be useful to White House Conference delegates and others in understanding a variety of citizens' recent everyday information needs.

Current Situations for Which Information Was Needed: During the interviews, respondents were requested, first of all, to explain recent situations from the past month or so in which they sought information. The 2,400 completed interviews resulted in 3,548 situations, both of a work and nonwork nature. Further insight into the situations was important to understand the context in which respondents turned to information source providers.

Following is a rank order of major situation categories faced by the people surveyed. The greatest number of situations related to consumer issues. Both occupational and non-occupational needs are reflected in all categories.

Situation	Number	Percent of Total Situations
Consumer Issues	476	13
Job-related: Technical[1]	470	13
Job-related: Getting/Changing jobs	355	10
Housing and Household Maintenance	291	8
Education and Schooling	242	7
Money Matters	185	5
Recreation	178	5
Job-related: Organizational Relations[2]	176	5
Health	154	4
Job-related: Salary and Benefits	126	4
Child Care	103	3
Personal Relations	102	3
Energy	65	2
Transportation	60	2
Assorted Miscellaneous and Other	565	16
Total	3,548	100

White House Conference Themes: Another way to view information needs is within the context of the five themes specified for the White House Conference. The 3,548 situations were reexamined on the basis of these themes. Data generated for the study dealt with all themes except "Increasing International Understanding and Cooperation."

---

[1] Issues related to execution of specific tasks or related to setting up business.

[2] Job definition and relations with supervisors and co-workers.

Some 73 percent of the information needs detailed by respondents related to the theme of "Meeting Personal Needs." The only other theme to generate wide interest was that of "Improving Organizations and the Professions." Twenty percent responded to this theme.

Themes	Number of Situations	Percent of Total Situations
I. Meeting Personal Needs		
a) serve in solving day-to-day problems	1,839	52
b) assist individuals in coping with trauma or crisis	172	5
c) inform the public of news and current events	106	3
d) support interests in cultural heritage, religion, and family life	195	5
e) accommodate needs in entertainment, recreation, and leisure activities	210	6
f) serve special constituencies	23	1
g) other (personal)	26	1
II. Enhancing Lifelong Learning		
a) support education in schools	71	2
b) concerns reinforcing higher education	78	2
c) erase illiteracy and improve reading skills of the general public	2	0*
d) enhance informal lifelong learning for pre-school age children and adults	17	0*
e) other	18	0*
III. Improving Organizations and the Professions		
a) serve organizations that provide products or services	458	13
b) support organizations that provide a benefit	10	0*
c) assist professions	169	5
d) other	68	2
IV. Effectively Governing Society		
a) increase citizen participation in public policy decisions	38	1
b) government needs for census, economic, weather, and other related information	6	0*
c) government needs related to public service, research, regulations and laws	36	1
Total	3,548	100%

Since "solving day-to-day problems" alone accounted for over 50 percent of the respondents' situations, it is of interest to note that 53 percent of the respondents to this goal had a high school education or less, were under 34 years of age, but were members of households with incomes of $15,000 and more.

Sources Used in Information Seeking: Respondents were given a list of source providers and asked to select those which they used, or were in the process of consulting, to resolve their information need. To ensure validity of responses, the list was randomized and presented in a prescribed manner.

---

*Percentages smaller than 0.55 are rounded off.

The sources consulted are shown below in the order of frequency given by the 2,400 respondents. Also given are the frequencies with which respondents regarded those sources used as the most and least helpful. Libraries were listed ninth in order of information source providers consulted. Libraries were considered as most helpful in 15 percent of the situations in which they were mentioned as a source of information. They were regarded as least helpful in 14 percent, and in the remaining 71 percent, they were an intermediary step in the information chain.

Sources Consulted	Number of Situations	Percent of Total Situations	Percent by Which Source is Listed as: Most Helpful	Percent by Which Source is Listed as: Least Helpful
Your own experience	2,573	74	25	16
Something a friend, neighbor, or relative told you	1,968	57	15	17
Something you read in a newspaper, magazine, or book	1,554	46	10	12
Something you learned from someone who works for a store, company, or business	1,553	45	10	10
Something you learned from a co-worker	1,509	43	12	11
Something told you by a professional such as a doctor or lawyer	1,398	40	13	6
Something you learned from someone who works [illegible] government	934	27	5	6
Something you saw or heard on TV or radio	717	21	1	8
Something you got from a library	580	17	3	3
Something you found in the telephone book	575	16	1	6
Something you learned from someone who works for a social service agency or charity	454	13	2	3
Something you learned from a religious leader	330	10	1	1
Other	164	5	2	0

The above sources of information were further grouped into broader categories: interpersonal (own experience, friend, neighbor, relative, or co-worker), institutional (professional, school, religious, library, social service or charity, or governmental), mass media (newspaper, television, magazine, books, or radio), and other. The following summarizes the percent of situations in which source categories were cited as most and least helpful by respondents.

Source Categories	Most Helpful	Least Helpful
Interpersonal	52%	44%
Institutional	35%	29%
Mass Media	11%	26%
Unclassified	2%	1%

Library Use and Non-use: Respondents were asked to specify the reasons why they used a library for the work and nonwork situations specified. Some 87 percent of those using libraries did so based on their perceptions that libraries held materials relevant to the resolution of their problems.

New England residents were most likely to draw upon interpersonal sources of information. Among those institutional sources consulted, libraries ranked fourth. Businesses, professionals, and government agencies were suggested more frequently than were libraries; social service agencies and religious leaders were consulted less frequently. Libraries were most often used as a source of information in situations dealing with consumer issues; job related: technical and getting/changing jobs; and education and schooling. Libraries were mentioned at least once in all of the remaining situation categories of neighborhood issues, transportation, public assistance, and crime and safety.

As indicated previously, libraries were among those sources of information consulted in only 17 percent of the total situations described. For those situations in which libraries were not given as an information source consulted, survey respondents were queried as to the major reasons. Their responses are given in the following table. Some 50 percent felt that either their situations did not require library use or the materials and services offered by libraries were in some way inadequate to the resolution of their information need. It might be noted that 11 percent maintained that they already had enough information and that access to libraries would only result in an information overload.

Reasons for Non-Use	Number of Situations	Percent of Library Non-Use Situations
Don't need libraries	766	26
Didn't think libraries could help	418	14
Had enough information from other sources	315	11
Didn't occur to me	288	10
No reason given	238	8
In the past, I could not find what I want/need; assume same would be true in this instance	207	7
Lack of time	164	6
Libraries don't own what I need/want	100	3
Inconvenient location	91	3
Library holdings are not current enough	68	2
Assorted miscellaneous and other	282	10

Robert D. Stueart
U.S. Office of Education Project, Boston

648

Testimony Submitted by Betty Taylor

A major program objective of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for the White House Conference on Library and Information Services is the development and funding of a national library network. The American Association of Law Libraries concurs with this objective and recognizes the vital importance of this goal and its significance in sharing bibliographic information with all types of users across the Nation. The American Association of Law Libraries' Network Committee strongly endorses this objective in principle and urges that the White House Conference incorporate the special needs of law libraries in the proposal for a national library network.

LAWNET, a national legal information network, including but not exclusively limited to bibliographic data, is under development by the American Association of Law Libraries and the Association of American Law Schools. LAWNET, with its particular responsibility for furnishing legal information to the legal community as well as to the public at large, possesses unique facets which should be brought to national attention. The AALL Network Committee urges that LAWNET be encompassed within any proposal promulgating a national library network. This paper is designed to identify the development components of LAWNET and to articulate the significance of LAWNET to information seekers throughout the country.

For nearly a decade the AALL has been striving to formalize a plan for a viable law network consistent with the requirements of the varied interests in the legal community. In the early 1970's, two members of the AALL Committee on Automation and Scientific Development submitted a position paper which outlined the development of a law network. The Committee adopted the principles of the paper and requested AALL action. The AALL president appointed a Special Network Committee, that also served as a joint committee with the Association of American Law Schools and the American Bar Association, to initiate the development of a law network. With the committee proposal as the basic descriptive document, the special committee set out to secure funding for the program. For a number of reasons, the economic recession being one of them, no sense of optimism for funding was evident in any of the Federal agencies or private foundations, which up to that point had been ardent supporters of developing computer programs and sharing of information resources.

In December, 1975, as an outgrowth of the interest sparked by the prior committee's activities, a group of law librarians met in Washington to revive the network discussions. This group met several times the following year and drafted study papers that were published under the title, *Law Library Consortium Data Base Components and Standards*, in 70 *Law Library Journal* 74 (1977).

In December, 1976, a Special Committee on Network Activities of the AALL was appointed with authorization to design a study on how best to implement a law library network. AALL successfully solicited the assistance of the AALS in contributing funds to engage a consultant. Information Access Corporation was hired as consultant. Its complete report is available from the AALL headquarters in Chicago.

The feasibility and viability of a law information network is certain, as concluded by the consultant, who recommended that AALL assume sponsorship for the development of LAWNET as a not-for-profit corporation owned by, but separate, from AALL. Personnel, governance, and membership segments are detailed with indepth suggestions for effective management of the network. The network committee decided this year to conduct the preliminary studies before obtaining funding and hiring a staff.

Procedures outlined by the consultant call for implementing LAWNET by identification of acceptable standards, building a composite data base, and identifying maintenance and updating techniques, licensing on-line services, and producing by-products, such as a *LAWNET Location Guide* and other reference publications.

The organization of the AALL Network Committee for 1978-80 follows the report recommendations. Subcommittees are presently studying standards, data bases, and governance and funding. Surveys of selected libraries should indicate the potential market for on-line services and/or microforms, the potential for building a composite data base, and standards presently in use by law libraries. The implications of law data in existing networks is under scrutiny.

The network committee anticipates negotiating for a composite machine-readable tape capable of loading for on-line services, and also capable of producing a COM catalog of those law libraries in the country which contribute their cataloging in a machine-readable format.

The AALL network committee requests NCLIS to include the LAWNET report in the materials submitted for delegate consideration for the White House Conference, and urges that any recommendations for funding a national library network specifically apportion funds to the development of LAWNET.

Betty Taylor
American Association of
Law Libraries

Testimony Submitted by David Tsuneishi

PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM ASIAN/PACIFIC AREA PARTICIPANTS

Whereas, traditionally America is a nation composed of native-born as well as foreign-born persons from different cultural and social backgrounds, who need to develop and become productive persons contributing in their own ways to the improvement of our society; and

Whereas, in recent years, a particularly large number of immigrants from Asian/Pacific areas have come with diverse multilingual and multicultural backgrounds and need immediate information and library services in order to become contributing members of our American society; and

Whereas, Public Law 93-568, which called for the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services, gives as the first statement of the intent of Congress that "access to information and ideas is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government";

Therefore, I, as an observer from the State of Maryland, and on behalf of the Asian/Pacific area participants to this White House Conference, do urge that: 1) a study by the newly formed Department of Education be initiated to determine the specific library and information needs of this new American population; 2) funding be provided to enable libraries with such multilingual and multicultural persons to conduct and update a community analysis for assessing specific needs; 3) funding be provided for materials and services to meet those identified needs; and 4) a program be federally funded for training suitable library and information personnel to specifically relate their knowledge of cultural and linguistic differences in order to provide effective services to these new Americans.

David Tsuneishi

Testimony Submitted by Marion Weiss

Of all the factors contributing to both the evolution of modern civilization and to the development of human existence, it is man's ability to communicate which has become one of the most significant and everlasting. The universal need to be known, to be remembered, and to be understood, has prevailed throughout the ages. Communication has persisted in the Lascaux Caves of the Pyrenees Mountains, which border France and Spain. The communicative urge has been recorded on the cuneiform tablets in the Tigres-Euphrates Valley, on the large obelisks in ancient Egypt, and on the rock carvings in the Sahara Desert. The Egyptian pyramids, the Mayan ruins, and the Aztec temples have all served as living testaments of man's desire for recognition.

Man's driving need to communicate remains the same today. The manner in which he does so has changed, however. Techniques are now more sophisticated and intricate, as new channels and forms have been added to the communication process. The film and television media are two such novel and more advanced types of communication.

These particular media, as sources for transmitting information to the general public, are ones which have remained unappreciated, or if appreciated at all, at least untapped. For television programs and feature films are still primarily seen as commercial entertainment or escapist fare. Their capacity to communicate knowledge about societal values, life-styles, world views, and human behavior is one often overlooked. In particular, television shows like *All in the Family,* or even *As the World Turns,* can serve as important informational sources about American family life and contemporary attitudes, beliefs, and values. Additionally, such programs can offer comments on morality and other time-binding concerns like war, justice, and love.[1]

Dramatic films can function in a similar way. Consider some recent movies dealing with contemporary aspects of marriage and the mid-life crisis, such as *10, Starting Over* and *Rich Kids.* Classic films of the past, likewise, can give a glimpse into the tyranny of war and power, as represented by Renoir's *Grand Illusion* and Welles' *Citizen Kane,* respectively.

Besides the commercially consumed television and film fare, another type of electronic media can offer information about the world in which we live. This kind can be classified as nontheatrical sources. Since World War II, the nontheatrical field has developed steadily into a large but fragmented network of local and State libraries, universities, schools, museums, film and television clubs, and other groups that buy or exhibit 16mm films of many kinds: documentary, educational, and promotional movies; Hollywood and foreign features transferred from 35mm; films made originally for television; and in recent years, avant garde and social statement pictures, many financed, at least partially, through public and private grants. Their subjects range from art to zoos, from aging to Zen.

To be more specific, educational films and television programs serve as an important part of information in the classroom. Thomas A. Edison, one of the earliest believers of film in education, in later life became pessimistic about its future. "I had some glowing dreams," he said, "about what the camera could be made to do and ought to do in teaching the world the things it needed to know—teaching it in a more vivid, direct way . . . I am disappointed that it has been turned into an entertainment toy."[2]

Edison made these comments 50 years ago. One wonders what he would say today if he could see how what he called "an entertainment toy" has grown up. Edison's disciplined and inventive mind would be stimulated by another, more systematic use of film represented by multimedia, multiple-image presentations where behavioral objectives are clearly specified—films which are designed for target audiences. He would find the motion picture an important part of the concept of "instructional technology," that branch of educational theory and practice concerned with the planning and use of a variety of media based upon recent research on teaching and learning.

The idea of a single student viewing a three-to-five-minute 8mm film on a cartridge-loading projector in a study carrel would be intriguing, but not completely new to the man who invented the "peep show" Kinetoscope in 1889. This forerunner of the motion picture was, in fact, also the grandfather of what seems to be a recent development (the individualized use of a single-concept film). It contained only about a minute of moving pictures, showing one idea seen by one person at a time. Edison thought that was the way it should be. But the variety of ways in which 16mm film, 8mm film, multiple-slide projectors, photographs, television, computer-based dial access, books, and other printed materials are used would undoubtedly modify his earlier opinion that film has become a "toy."

Today, the successful informational film and television program is a logical commodity—with a frame, sequence, beginning, middle, and end. They are designed for a known audience and to match specified outcomes related to instructional goals. There is, classically, an introduction, a summary, and some additional repetition in the body of the program itself. Pictures and words are closely related; the vocabulary is geared to the intended audience level; the program is often allied to a text; and there is usually a teacher's manual or study guide.

Those nontheatrical film and television shows classified as avant garde also serve as an important informational source. Traditionally, these works have been seen as producing film and television as art. But often, these same ventures will be significant for a unique point of view; or as a documentary on a specific subject the commerical industry failed to treat.

For example, during World War II, commercial films tended to be comedies, musicals, and war films. At the same time, Maya Deren made *Meshes of the Afternoon,* which gives a different view of the period. One can see in her film that individuals continued to be troubled by sexual and identity conflicts. In other words, her movie revealed the internal landscape of a mind during the 1940's, whereas the commercial films were about society's view of surface reality.

Many avant garde films and television programs have as their prime importance the documentation of some common or national event, or even the documentation of another work of art. The best movies about happenings are these kinds of avant garde ventures, like Robert Breer's *Homage to Jean Tinguely's Homage to New York* or Breer's *Pat's Birthday,* with Claes Oldenburg. Stan Brakhage's *Window Water Baby Moving,* a personal documentary on the birth of his first child, is considered by some doctors to be the best glimpse of natural childbirth. Bruce Conner's *Report* is probably the most remarkable recreation of the national mood immediately following President Kennedy's assassination.

Most of those working with one foot in film and television continued to share Edison's early optimism and his "glowing" dreams about what the camera can be made to do and ought to do in "teaching the world the things it needs to know—teaching it in a more vivid, direct way." Only if our proliferating technology and our knowledge of the art and science of imagery can be directed toward this humanistic end can man hope to find himself and fulfill his prophetic human destiny.

Footnotes

[1] *The results of twenty-three different studies by the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on TV and Social Behavior in 1972 showed that 85 percent of American viewers believed that many soap operas, police series, and medical dramatizations show life as it really is and that they are both "realistic" and "instructional."*

[2] *Lifton, Robert Jay. "Protean Man."* Yale Alumni Review, *Jan., 1969, pp. 14-21. My thanks to Dr. Robert Wagner, Professor of Cinema. Ohio State University.*

Marion Weiss
University Film Association

Testimony Submitted by Alvin H. White

Healthy development of our living, organic, planetary, subdivisional socio-political body—during the aging processes from the relatively youthful childhood times of embryonic fertilization and the increasingly complex growth of maturing sensory telecommunicating neural information transmission systems to the on-line memory, which in turn is drawn upon by the judgmental decisionmaking faculties which calculate and compute rational formulae governing the allocation of time, energy, and other of the body's resources in attempting to approximate the optimum distribution for reducing the probability of suffering future pain may or may not be wisely considered important in this White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Government of the body, by the body, and for the body in healthy, long-lived, and relatively pain-free higher organisms has been shown throughout natural history to have been substantially directed toward the development of an integrated brain and nervous system capable of increasing its sensibilities, information processing, storage, and transmission rates.

Lastly, let me say that I feel WHCLIS has underemphasized future utility of machine translation and computer speech from on-line information for users of this planet's minority languages.

Alvin H. White
General Secretary of the Aging World
Brain Machine Neural Telecommunications
Coalition Continuing Lifelong Health
Legislative, Scientific and Technical
Information Systems Education and
Testing Research and Development
Organization Planning Study

Joint Congressional Hearing on Library and Information Services

At 11:15 a.m., November 19, 1979, Senator Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, and Congressman William D. Ford, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, convened the joint congressional hearing on library and information services. This hearing, held at the site of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, was intended, in Senator Pell's words, to "provide the two subcommittees with some initial recommendations that the Members could review in the very near future."

Appreciating the important role the Congress played in the sponsorship of the Conference, the Program Subcommittee of the Conference Advisory Committee proposed that a joint hearing, sponsored by the Conference and conducted by the appropriate congressional committees, be held on the last day of the formal sessions of the Conference. Concurring with this recommendation, the Advisory Committee designated Robert L. Chartrand, Chairman of the Program Subcommittee, to oversee the implementation of the hearing. Charles Benton, Chairman of the Conference and Chairman of NCLIS, explored the idea with Senator Claiborne Pell, Congressman William Ford, and Congressman John Brademas, the original House sponsors for the Conference. After receiving these Members' enthusiastic support, three key congressional aides were assigned to assist in planning the hearing: Richard Jerue and David Morse, from the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities; and Roberta Stanley from the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. In addition, Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar, Associate Director of NCLIS; Jack Duncan, legislative consultant to the Conference; and Jean-Paul Emard, analyst in information sciences for the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress, were named to the planning group.

Faced with a tight Conference program and a limited amount of available time for the hearings, the planning group determined that two witnesses for each of the five Conference themes would be asked to testify before a joint panel of Senate and House Members. Care was taken to invite 10 Conference delegates who could speak knowledgeably about the issues, based on vocation and experience. They were asked to submit written statements that could be summarized for oral presentation at the hearing.

Attending the hearing were the following:

Representative John Brademas (Indiana)
Representative George E. Brown, Jr. (California)
Representative John H. Buchanan, Jr. (Alabama)
Resident Commissioner Baltasar Corrada (Puerto Rico)
Representative William D. Ford (Michigan)
Representative Albert Gore (Tennessee)
Senator Jacob K. Javits (New York)
Senator Claiborne Pell (Rhode Island)
Senator Robert T. Stafford (Vermont)
Representative Ted S. Weiss (New York)

In their opening statements, the Members paid tribute to the delegates, alternates, and observers attending the Conference, citing their hard work in developing recommendations for solutions to numerous library and information issues. Echoing Senator Pell's remarks regarding the purpose of the hearing, Representative Ford stated that the gathering provided "a sampling of the combined thought of the fine people who had spent a very busy and productive weekend at the Conference," and that the Conference program and the hearing could assist Congress in its "development of a body of knowledge and understanding with respect to the very large and complex array of activities at the local, State, and Federal levels which deal with library sciences and information services."

Chairman Charles Benton, serving as the official host to the Conference, formally greeted the Members on behalf of NCLIS and the Conference. In addition to expressing his appreciation for the Members' support of the Commission, the Conference program, and the delegates' recommendations, Benton expressed the thanks of NCLIS and the Conference to the two staffs of the subcommittees and the Conference program subcommittee.

The order of testimony, determined by the five theme areas, was as follows:

Panel I—Personal Needs
Martha G. Register—Counseling/Rehabilitation Psychologist, Charlotte Rehabilitation Hospital, Charlotte, North Carolina
Gary Young—Director, Cultural Heritage Center, Yakima Indian Nation, Toppenish, Washington

Panel II—Lifelong Learning
Susan Edmonson—Ashland Child Development Center, Ashland, Kentucky
Nasario Garcia—Professor, University of Colorado, Pueblo, Colorado

Panel III—Organizations and the Professions
David E. King—Librarian and Senior Editor, Standard Educational Corporation, Chicago, Illinois
Dwight Andrew Myers—Assistant Vice President, Sales Administration and Planning, General Book Marketing Division, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico

Panel IV—Governing Society
Justice Sam Ross Harshbarger—Supreme Court of Appeals, Charleston, West Virginia
Whitney North Seymour, Jr.—Director, Emergency Committee to Save Our Public Libraries, New York, New York

Panel V—International Cooperation
Louis A. Lerner—U.S. Ambassador to Norway, Oslo, Norway
Gilbert A. Sprauve—College of the Virgin Islands, St. Johns, Virgin Islands

In addition, Delia Martinez, delegate from Nevada, and the Honorable Carl Elliott, delegate from Alabama, were invited to present a resolution passed by the delegates earlier that morning. This resolution called for the creation of an Office of Library and Information Services in the new Department of Education, directed by an Assistant Secretary of Education. This Assistant Secretary should: 1) administer all grants and programs currently administered by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources; and 2) establish communications with all Federal programs related to library and information services. Senator Pell assured the witnesses that this topic would be discussed with Secretary-designate Hufstedler at her Senate confirmation hearings.

The remarks prepared by Martha Register were read by Annette Phinazee, Dean of the School of Library Sciences, North Carolina Central University. Ms. Register, a paraplegic, asked that th members of each participating committee consider and pass appropriate legislation that would take into account the following goals relative to library and information services in meeting personal needs: 1) serve people in solving day-to-day problems; 2) assist individuals in coping with trauma or crisis; 3) inform the public of news and current events; 4) support interest in cultural heritage, religion, and family life; and 5) accommodate needs in entertainment, recreation, and leisure activities. Ms. Register also stressed the need for legislation that would serve special constituencies, such as the homebound, senior citizens, and the handicapped.

Gary Young's testimony also centered on the need for library and information services to a special constituency, the American Indian. Citing this country's shift "from a policy of the melting pot society to that of recognizing and appreciating—in fact, valuing—cultural diversity," Young requested that Congress pass specific Indian library legislation. Through active support and enactment of such measures as the National Indian Omnibus Library Bill, the Senate and the House could aid in averting the "high rate of poverty, underemployment, and unemployment" that have plagued many Indian nations in the past.

In addressing library and information services for lifelong learning, Susan Edmonson reviewed the entire spectrum of education in American society, from childhood through adulthood. According to Edmonson, legislation was necessary in this and succeeding Congresses to: 1) achieve an extension of basic library and information services to all areas of our country; 2) provide needed and necessary library media centers and strong information retrieval skills training in every school; 3) establish a nationwide network of libraries; and 4) designate libraries as educational agencies so that such libraries could be deliberately included in those legislative programs aimed at continuing education.

Nasario Garcia, in follow-on testimony, reviewed five areas that have had a direct impact on lifelong learning: 1) the ever-increasing use of libraries for practical, factual, consumer-oriented information versus more philosophical aspects of information; 2) the Federal Government's role in assisting libraries in fulfilling their responsibility of providing some form of continuing education; 3) the use of networking among libraries and information centers to provide faster linkage between metropolitan and rural communities and to assist in more expeditious interlibrary loans; 4) the Federal Government's continued support and improvement of information dissemination, especially through the expansion of the Federal depository library system; and 5) the eradication of illiteracy. Through the revision of existing legislation, such as the Library Services and Construction Act (Public Law 88-269 and its amendments), and the development of new programs, these five areas of concern, according to Garcia, might begin to provide needed services that would "benefit all citizens, young and old, rich and poor, as we prepare to enter the 1980's." Furthermore, "nowhere is information more central to success than in the work-a-day world of business and the professions. Results of success in putting good information to work are found in the production of safer and more efficient products, in more effective services, in more personally satisfying work experiences, and in increased economic productivity."

With this thought in mind, David King examined the roles played by special libraries and information centers—some 8,000 to 15,000 in number—in providing needed information to organizations and professionals. King specifically felt that Congress should: 1) scrutinize State policies regarding network participation by all special libraries and information centers and formulate legislation that would allow these entities to use such federally funded networks; 2) offer financial incentives to States in order to encourage them to include specialized information providers in statewide information and library networks; 3) support a national assessment of existing collections of information resources; 4) adopt stronger legislation to allow greater use of government-sponsored research and information; and 5) continue the funding and support of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

In discussing the trend toward increased use of modern information technology and its ability to deliver information goods and services in a more timely fashion, Dwight Myers asserted that "archaic local public sector economics, erratically funded, cannot continue to be the main support of our public system. Local libraries cannot fund the start-up of national, regional, or even local data bases." What Myers proposed is a national library agency that would: 1) coordinate existing Federal programs of information service; 2) reduce duplication of effort and resources in all mandated Federal legislation requiring information access; and 3) establish national policies to eliminate unproductive competition and antagonisms between the public and private sectors. Citizen access to such congressional and executive branch data banks as the Congressional Research Service's SCORPIO system and the Department of Energy's RECON system should be encouraged. While strong general support for a national library act is necessary, Myers asserted that a citizens' advisory group, made up of one delegate from each State delegation to the Conference, should be established to work in close conjunction with the NCLIS staff. Such an arrangement would ensure the broadest possible interpretation of and support for such a measure. Finally, Myers suggested that definite provisions must be devised to guarantee the payment of information producers for their creative efforts.

In summarizing his testimony, Justice Sam Ross Harshbarger emphasized increasing literacy, extending library services, augmenting school services, and providing outreach programs "to those unserved or unable to serve themselves." In addition, Justice Harshbarger reaffirmed the protections provided in the first amendment that "guarantee everyone access to materials, guarantee the right to write, guarantee publishing rights, and of course the other side of those issues is that people be able to use those materials which are available to them." Only by making the strongest efforts in these areas could government officials make every citizen realize the full potential of libraries and information services and "increase, hopefully, the ability of the American people to govern themselves effectively."

In tracing the development of our democratic society and the parallel growth of free, community-based libraries in this country, Whitney North Seymour Jr., singled out the increasing problems faced by today's public libraries: reduced hours of service, staff cutbacks, and limited acquisition programs. Having been affected by reduced local tax bases and the continued upward spiral of inflation, Seymour pointed out that "as the free public library is increasingly in jeopardy, so our freedom comes into jeopardy." The means by which Seymour advocated a change in public libraries' fortunes is through Congress' endorsement and passage of a national library act that would "incorporate the general principles, goals, and objectives of S.1124 96th Congress." To show support for such a proposal, the joint panel was presented with petitions signed by a number of delegates and observers. In subsequent questioning, Seymour stated that, as a result of reviewing the total array of resolutions voted upon by the delegates, "the Act should be expanded quite substantially in its coverage, and that it should probably include not only public libraries directly, but also the school and academic libraries."

In presenting his views on library and information services in a world where there is an increasing need for international cooperation, Ambassador Louis Lerner stressed that "information is hot; information is political; information is geo-strategic; and information is defense as well. We must use whatever we have to move information into an international arena, with the United States as the leader." Ambassador Lerner outlined for the joint panel eight key points that he felt were of both national and international importance: 1) Americans must be made aware of the impact the information revolution will have on their lives; 2) as this revolution unfolds, there must be a continued dialogue within government and between the government and the private information sector; 3) there must be a viable Federal and national information policy; 4) market forces will be important in the information era, thus better planning in regards to needed and affordable public and private information networks must be carried out; 5) the United States should sponsor special programs in library sciences, information storage and retrieval techniques, and modern information technology for foreign librarians and information specialists, especially those from developing countries; 6) our Nation's young people should begin immediate training in foreign languages in order to communicate, comprehend, and exchange ideas and information; 7) with the continued compression of time and space, coupled with faster means of communications, world events are no longer isolated incidents but potential threats to our national security; and 8) as a world leader in information, the United States must devise "practical yet creative programs" in order to assist developing countries.

Gilbert Sprauve amplified Ambassador Lerner's final point by recommending the development of a model information exchange program that could be located in the Virgin Islands, his native region. Specifically, Sprauve proposed the establishment, through joint Federal and local government participation, of a model center for international information exchange. Such a center would have three primary functions: 1) to serve as a regional network facility; 2) to be an adjunct to the Library of Congress in this part of the West Indies; and 3) to serve as a clearinghouse for information goods and services. Stressing the importance that United States Information Service libraries have played as "bridgeheads against the tyranny of ignorance," the development of such a model center "tomorrow, in the place of one of those USIS libraries of two decades ago, would signal a timely and appropriate new thrust in the foreign policy of this Nation."

After thanking the panelists and the audience, Congressman Ford mentioned a newly released book, *Information Technology Serving Society,* which is dedicated to Congressman Brademas and the late Congressman William Steiger of Wisconsin, advocates of strong information-oriented congressional and national programs. Prior to adjourning the hearing, the Chair announced that the hearing record would be left open so that additional comments and written testimony could be incorporated into the proceedings.

Participants

Introduction

Offical delegates and alternates to the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services were selected by 58 State and Territorial conferences held between September 15, 1977, and July 20, 1979. These pre-White House Conferences were held in 49 States, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territories of the Pacific, and the Virgin Islands, and by American Indians on or near reservations and the Federal library community.

There were 568 delegates and 238 alternates chosen by the pre-White House Conferences. An additional 105 at-large delegates were selected by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), with the advice of the White House Conference Advisory Committee, in order to compensate for any demographic or professional imbalances that might have inadvertently occurred in the State/Territorial delegate selection process nationwide.

To achieve the composition of the Conference authorized by Congress, NCLIS adopted the recommendation put forth by the Advisory Committee that one-third of the delegates should be professionals from the library and information services community, while two-thirds should be citizen representatives. This distinction is indicated in the list of delegates and alternates on the following pages by the headings "library" and "lay."

As specified by Public Law 93-568, the White House Conference brought together representatives from: 1) local, statewide, regional, and national institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations which provide library and information services to the public; 2) educational institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations (including professional and scholarly associations for the advancement of education and research); 3) persons with special knowledge of, and special competence in, technology as it may be used for the improvement of library and information services; and 4) representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people, and other members of the general public.

This was meant to assure the broadest possible representation of the American public at the Conference. The delegates who actually took part in the national Conference were an interesting sampling of Americans, if not an actual cross section. For example, they included a blueberry farmer from Maine, a dentist from Texas, a psychologist from North Carolina, a motel owner from New Mexico, a dance instructor from Maryland, as well as a number of deaf, blind, and physically handicapped individuals . . . a group as diverse as are library and information services users across the Nation.

These 911 participants met in Washington, D.C., November 15th to 19th, 1979, to help shape the course of libraries and information services in the United States through the 1980's and beyond. As Charles Benton, Chairman of the Conference and of NCLIS, told the delegates, they "were called to Washington to take a fresh look at America's library and information needs in light of the knowledge explosion and the new technologies created to deal with it." They debated issues and voted on resolutions which will have an important impact on the Federal Government's future information policy.

The Conference structure consisted of five major theme areas: Library and Information Services for—1) Personal Needs; 2) Lifelong Learning; 3) Organizations and the Professions; 4) Governing Society; and 5) International Cooperation and Understanding. After choosing one of the five theme areas, each delegate was assigned to a small work group within that theme. Through the discussion of issues, each work group developed a set of resolutions, which were then further debated and discussed at its theme session. At the final theme session, the delegates voted out those resolutions they considered most significant to go to the general session.

On the final day of the Conference, the entire body of delegates met in general session and voted for the 64 resolutions they wanted to present to the President. They produced important statements on nearly every relevant issue. One of their decisions included appointing a Committee of the Conference, consisting of 10 delegates, who would review the final version of the resolutions and approve their form and content before they were forwarded to the President. This committee met on January 5, 1980, in Chicago to discuss and approve the final resolutions.

The mission of the White House Conference participants did not end with the adjournment of the Conference. As President Carter told them when he addressed them, "I hope if you don't do anything else at this Conference, that you will learn from one another how best to present the opportunities of library use, and then take that message home and distribute it with the greatest degree of enthusiasm and commitment."

This hope was emphasized by Chairman Benton when he said, "This Conference is a culminating event—but it is also a new beginning. The final history of the Conference is still being written."

664

Delegates and Alternates

ALASKA

DELEGATES: LAY
Elizabeth Jean Fallon
Ronald K. Inouye
Walter E. Johnson
Silver Stanfill
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Isabelle Mudd
H. Theodore Ryberg

ALTERNATES: LAY
Mary V. Beans
Charlene Rose Nelson
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
*Richard Bruce Engen

ALABAMA

DELEGATES: LAY
Justice Miron Bigbie
Bettye Fine Collins
*The Honorable Carl A. Elliott, Sr.
William Carl King
Jane Mabry
Sidney Edwin Sandridge
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Nancy R. Agnew
Geraldine Watts Bell
Nancy Cummings Gonce
Kay Lee Vowvalidis

ALTERNATES: LAY
W. Byron Causey
Truman M. Pierce
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
William Carl Highfill
Anthony William Miele

ARKANSAS

DELEGATES: LAY
Carlton R. Hasley
Elizabeth Howze Hodge
Harriet Hillis Jansma
Karen Sue Lackey
Harry V. Smith
*Donald Wayne Stone
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Fred K. Darragh, Jr.
Mrs. Corliss M. Howard
Richard H. Reid

ALTERNATES: LAY
Betty Jo Fite Hays
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Frances Nix

ARIZONA

DELEGATES: LAY
*Elizabeth R. Farish
Trini I. Goebel
Heinz R. Hink
Diana Lynn Porter
Weldon P. Shofstall
Niki David Shrode
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Marguerite Pasquale
Frank R. Rodriguez

ALTERNATES: LAY
William Scribner
Esther Don Tang
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Haul Millis Reddick

Indicates Chair of the State delegation

CALIFORNIA

DELEGATES: LAY
Albert Lopez Amezquita
Margaret M. Castro
Paul Steven Chitlik
Diane Tamara Dei-Amoah
Kevin Scot Dickerson
Ernest Guzman
Karen Jane Husemeyer
Vivien Cienfuegos Ide
George Ige
Marge Klugman
Ida Jackson Miller
Gordon Moreno
Deborah Morillo
Carole Anne Onorato
Hazel M. Russell
Aileen Rinehart Schrader
Josie D. Shaw
J.R. Starr
Shirley B. Stearns
Arthur Duane Taylor
Norma E. Yamada
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Barbara Louise Anderson
Ethel Stacy Crockett
June D. Fleming
Ruby Ling Louie
Jesus Luna
*Morris Polan
Elizabeth Martinez Smith
John Darcy Smith
Amanda L. Williams
Nancy Yingst

ALTERNATES: LAY
Peter Maitland Bell
Miv Schaaf
Sandy Schuckett
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Cecily Ann Cocco
James E. Crayton
Carol E. Moss

COLORADO

DELEGATES: LAY
*Lenore Neill Bright
Dennis William Lum
Thomas Robert Meyer
Jeanne Marie Moore
Richard John Morton
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Kenneth Everett Dowlin
Linda M. Miller
Barbara D. Tooker

ALTERNATES: LAY
Jacquie Haughton
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Anne Marie McMahon Falsone

CONNECTICUT

DELEGATES: LAY
Douglas A. Beals
Howard E. May
Brian Christopher McCarroll
*Geil D. Orcutt
Leonor Toro
Christine Woodberry
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Elfrieda B. McCauley
John Peter McDonald
Dency C. Sargent

ALTERNATES: LAY
Theodore H. Kreinik
Claire Glass Miller
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Charles E. Funk, Jr.
Mabel F. Rice McKissick

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DELEGATES: LAY
Robert Irving Artisst
Yetta W. Galiber
*Lillian J. Huff

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Hardy Rogers Franklin
Marilyn Elaine Moser
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Barbara Rosalie Robinson

DELAWARE

DELEGATES: LAY
*Henry Richard Folsom
Gerald Thomas Goodman
Zoe Wheeler
Mary H. Woodruff
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Florence Simkins Brown
Patricia A. Scarry

ALTERNATES: LAY
Dale Fields
Rebecca Hall Scarborough
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Sylvia I. Short

FLORIDA

DELEGATES: LAY
Bobbie Eugene Brooks
Brian Lee Dyak
John Middleton Erving, Jr.
Homer Hooks
Elaine Lobl Konigsburg
Jeanne K. Malchon
Leonard L. Mosby, Jr.
Ernest Wilbur Newman
Sabrina Maria Shirley
George E. Stocking
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Errol Vincent Campbell
William James Condon
*Barbara Duncan Cooper
Sister Franz Lang, O.P.
Sandra Wynell Ulm

ALTERNATES: LAY
Lana Jane Brent
Alicia E. Cervera
Harry Michael Cunningham
Frank Robert Evans
Virginia S. Young
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Shirley Louise Aaron
Grace Elizabeth W. Taylor

GEORGIA

DELEGATES: LAY
Viola Maude Allen
Janet Belflower Barker
Albert Blanch
Louie Clark
Mozelle Dailey Clemmons
Charlotte West Dekle
Roy A. Hendricks
C.B. Ward
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Barbara C. Cade
Mary Elizabeth Cole
*William J. Peterson
A. Roy Rowland
Ella Gaines Yates

ALTERNATES: LAY
Ernestine Brazeal
Zell Bryan Miller
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Charles Edward Beard
Emily C. Payne

HAWAII

DELEGATES: LAY
Clinton Kealohapauole Akana
Wilfred Atsushi Hokama
Sally Eugenio La'i
Betsy Mineko Sakata
Margaret Wessel Stearns

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
*Agnes Catherine Conrad
Donna Marie Garcia

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Ruth Petrowski

IOWA

DELEGATES: LAY
Joe Eugene Brown
Laurna Jane Hansen
Edward H. Healey
Phyllis Joan Priest
Mary Colleen Wenthe
Daniel John Winegarden
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
*William Joseph Burns
Beverly Florence Lind
Marie Helen Wallinga

ALTERNATES: LAY
Gladys Selma Benz
Rosemary Burns Olos
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Thomas Leo Carney

IDAHO

DELEGATES: LAY
George S. Artemis
Beverly Barbara Bistline
Ernestine Garcia
*Linda Pall
Patricia Nerina Romanko
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Linda Elizabeth Ayers
Frances Schouler Heard

ALTERNATES: LAY
Vivian Dean Gottsch
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Mary Wolff Lesser

ILLINOIS

DELEGATES: LAY
Nancy Mary Abbate
John Alphonso Armendariz
William James Boyd
Cullom Davis
Christopher Lawrence Donahue
Helen Dayle Eldredge
Eugene Walter Holmes
Arthur L. Jackson
*Elizabeth H. Lawson
Elizabeth Maloney
Patrick Charles Racey
David Mitchell Truitt
Howard R. Veal, Sr.
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Howard W. Dillon
David Edgar King
Robert Royce McClarren
Sharon P. Simmons
Peggy A. Sullivan
*Donald Eugene Wright

ALTERNATES:
Terrell Hill
ALTERNATES: LAY
George L. Adams
Charlene Hext Bentz
Hans J. Fischer
Virginia Josephine Williams
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Kathryn J. Gesterfield
Ray E. Howser
Jerome R. Podesva

INDIANA

DELEGATES: LAY
Ralph Donald Ayres
Harold Bob Hanes
Max Martin Marsh
William M.S. Myers
Richard V. Pierard
Philip Godfrey Schairbaum
D. Richard Smith
Barbara Leek Wesson
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Miriam Anna Drake
L. Jean Jose
Phyllis M. Land
Barbara Evans Markuson

ALTERNATES: LAY
Sadie Williams Shropshire
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Charles Ray Ewick
*Alice Leila Wert

KANSAS

DELEGATES: LAY
Ada Marie Arford
Robert Chester Caldwell
Keith R. Henry
Patrick Stafford Kelley
Sandra Easton O'Neil
Constance Clarke Yoxall
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Duane F. Johnson
*James Conway Marvin

ALTERNATES: LAY
Mary Jo Gurley
Mary Helen Dale Misegadis
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Brittany Grace Fisher

KENTUCKY

DELEGATES: LAY
Susan Edmonson
William John Leffler II
Elaine Myrle McLellan
Patricia Hill Miles
Sue Vansant Palmer
Edward Norman Sims, Jr.

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
*Ronald Stephan Kozlowski
Wanda Fulkerson Potter
Deborah Huenefeld Ward
Earl Eugene Wassom

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Edwin Charles Strohecker

LOUISIANA

DELEGATES: LAY
Anita D. Auzenne
Pythina Brown
Aromenta Evans
Paul Vinson Myers
Rosemary Grisham Patterson
John Charles Rice, Jr.
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Alex P. Allain
Paulette H. Holahan
Lynda Mills Netherland
*John B. Richard

ALTERNATES: LAY
Damon Andrew Veach
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Thomas F. Jaques

MASSACHUSETTS

DELEGATES: LAY
John Maxfield Benbow
*Channing Lindquist Bete
Kathleen Marie Furlani
Claire Agnes Gingras
Ming Ivory
Janet Risha London
Jesse L. Parks
Dorothy Jordan Pryor
Daniel Francis Toomey
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Alice Marie Cahill
Barbara Clark Elam
Peter Low Fenton
Nancy C. Jacobson

ALTERNATES: LAY
Felice M. Forrest
Beatrice Emmons Lingley
M. Elizabeth Moltrup
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Robert D. Stueart

MARYLAND

DELEGATES: LAY
*Dorothy M. Beaman
Rosemary Phillips Chappelle
Marion Frances Keenan
Ruth N. Reid
William Trammell Snyder
Janie M. Whitmore
Katherine Elson Zadravec
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Thomas D. Bradley
Helen Joanne Harrar
*Grace Payson Slocum

ALTERNATES: LAY
John Thomas Hanson
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Alvin Edward Miller
Nettie B. Taylor

MAINE

DELEGATES: LAY
Donald Bouchard
*William John McKenna Caldwell
Vladimir Grigorievich Drozdoff
*Katy L. Perry
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Edward Valmore Chenevert
Michael Philip Cyr
Richard Francis Gross

ALTERNATES: LAY
Vivian Dow
Lawrence Alan Spiegel
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
J. Gary Nichols

MICHIGAN

DELEGATES: LAY
Del B. Becker
Viola J. Brown
C. Arnold Carlson
*E. Jean Frazier
Snow Flake Grigsby
Irwin Toby Holtzman
Carol Lou Linderoth
Anthony Cerda Martinez
Jeannine Carrol Rebentisch
Deborah J. Tucker
H. Ashley Weeks
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
*Thomas Earl Alford
Robert Gene Gaylor
Jean Elizabeth Lowrie
M. Elizabeth Moore
Joann Louise Wilcox

ALTERNATES: LAY
Diana Deresz
Betty Louise Irgens
Clydell M. Jones
Katherine S. MacKenzie
Roslynn Elizabeth McCoy
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Shirley Ann Clark
Francis X. Scannell

MINNESOTA

DELEGATES: LAY
Mabel Evans Cason
Joanne V. Hart
Nadine Ann Jacobson
Dianne L. Kimm
Thomas McCurdy Lufkin
Andrew Arthur Olson
*Terence Frederick Stone
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Patricia Chayne Harpole
Barbara Joyce Nemer
Robert H. Rohlf

ALTERNATES: LAY
Anthony Leo Genia
Kathy Diana Robson
Ann S. Thomas
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
William George Asp

MISSOURI

DELEGATES: LAY
Henry Edward Bent
Mark Langdon Freeman
Mildred Alice King
Marilyn Hope Lake
Assunta A. Lilley
Gwendolyn Jean Myers
Denny Eugene Pilant
John Joseph Scanlon
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
M. Joan Collett
*Susie Donnelly
Charles O'Halloran
Nancy Hunter Stiegemeyer

ALTERNATES: LAY
Judith Rose Campbell
Diane Libby Smith
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Ronald G. Bohley
Sara Inger Hill

MISSISSIPPI

DELEGATES: LAY
Ted J. Alexander
Bruce J. Hanson
John Tillman Laughlin
Traci Lynn Patterson
Victoria Ann Pickering
Wanda Camielle Thomas

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Lelon Olester Davidson
Rush Glenn Miller, Jr.
*Jack Clarendon Mulkey

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Joe B. Forsee

MONTANA

DELEGATES: LAY
George Arthur Mattson
Elizabeth Mary McNamer
*James H. Nybo
Arlo Dole Skari
Harold Gustave Stearns
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Karen Elizabeth Everett
Alma S. Jacobs

NORTH CAROLINA

DELEGATES: LAY
Margaret Louise Cain
John Hector Clark
Walter Lee Davis, Jr.
Mary Catherine Dunn
Howard J. Hunter, Jr.
Martha Gwendolyn Register
Addison Neal Smith
Isaac Brown Southerland
Carrie Cole Winter

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Elsie L. Brumback
Margaret Ann Griffin
H. William O'Shea
*Annette Lewis Phinazee

ALTERNATES: LAY
Raymond Peter Pach
Charles Anthony Thompson
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
David Neil McKay

NORTH DAKOTA

DELEGATES: LAY
Hazel Delilah Doan
Judi Vogelsang
Peggy A. Warren
*Boyd Lewis Wright
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Gloria Ann Dohman
Jacqueline S. Mundy

ALTERNATES: LAY
Diane Scott Duty
Joanne Helen Pahlmeyer

NEBRASKA

DELEGATES: LAY
Bertha W. Calloway
*Ellen Rae Lierk
Robert L. Newman
Eileen Marie Wirth
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Robert Michael Braude
Raymond B. Means
Jerome Rakov

ALTERNATES: LAY
Joseph E. Johnson
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
John Lester Kopischke

NEW HAMPSHIRE

DELEGATES: LAY
Frank Clement Mevers
Patricia Morag Skinner
Judith M. Stahl
The Hon. Betty Jo Taffe
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Norma Stanton Creaghe
Carolyn Beth Duston
*Sherman Clayton Pridham

ALTERNATES: LAY
Homer Eaton Stavely, Jr.
Samuel E. Worthen
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Avis McCrillis Duckworth

NEW JERSEY

DELEGATES: LAY
Phyllis L. Ball
Marie Paule Benoit
Ivory Melvin Buck, Jr.
Sister Carmela M. Cristiano, S.C.
Stanley Olando Farrow
Barbara D. Green
J. Maurice Hicks
Junius L. Jackson
Julius James
Kathryn T. Malvern
Virginia Stafford Potter
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Mary Joyce Doyle
*Donald Ross King
Priscilla Mary Linsley
Arabelle Kimble Pennypacker
*Renee Becker Swartz

ALTERNATES: LAY
Siegmar Silber
Judith A. St. George
Barbara Zang
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Michael Bernard Binder
Barbara F. Weaver

NEW MEXICO

DELEGATES: LAY
Evelyn Booms
William Richard Prince
Richard Jason Rundell
Johnnie Beatrice Scott
Steve S. Torres
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Vida Celestine Hollis
*Paul Vassallo

ALTERNATES: LAY
Dwight Andrew Myers
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Lois Erwin Godfrey

NEVADA

DELEGATES: LAY
*Yolan LaVerne Goodrich
Lyle R. Jones
Margaret Ann Lynch
*Delia E. Martinez

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Hazel Pierce Potter
Ann Elizabeth Thompson

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Blanche Marsh Zucker

NEW YORK

DELEGATES: LAY
Gordon M. Ambach
Vivian V. Bailey
Lansing Gregory Baker
Sherry Brandsema
Laura Bradley Chodos
Hazel Grubbs Davis
Hugh Thomas Farley
Donna Marie Fish
Alfred A. Giardino
Jacob Goldfein
Jeanne Spriter James

Jayne Bullard Kamlot
Byron A. Lee
Annie B. Martin
Steven Anthony Pico
Adelaide Therese Scanlon, MD
The Hon. Edward C. Sullivan
Dorothy Bucknam Wadsworth
Ellen B. Woodrich

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Linda M. Bretz
Mary B. Cassata
Richard Lewis Darling
Morris Arthur Gelfand
*Dinah Lindauer
Stanley Austin Ransom
Carlton C. Rochell
Joseph F. Shubert
Beverly Jean Ryd Small
Esther M. Swanker
Lucille C. Thomas

ALTERNATES: LAY
Joyce Ann Catania
Cynthia Lee Ivey

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Glyn Tecwyn Evans
Mildred Lowe
Patricia H. Mautino
Gerald Robert Shields

OHIO

DELEGATES: LAY
*Helmut A. Alpers
Gayle Ann Brubaker
Marsha Judyth Caplan
Joseph M. Denham
The Rev. Robert Dye
Robert R. Fox
Donald Osbun Fullerton
Karen Marie Harvey
Karla M. Lortz
Mariam Charl Noland
Edward F. Sarno
Paul D. Uhrig
Billy Wright, Jr.

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Vivian Shelton Balester
Raymond R. Brown
Nancy M. Lorenzi
A. Robert Rogers
John William Patrick Storck
John S. Wallach

ALTERNATES: LAY
Paul Nick Dicaprio
Alice Bope Parsons
Marie Frances Singleton
Jill Anne Smithson
Samuel Albert Wolpert

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Margaret Ann Lindley
Chris H. Saylor
H. Paul Schrank, Jr.

OKLAHOMA

DELEGATES: LAY
Mary Ann Gaberino
Helen Freudenberger Holmes
Gail Schaeffer Miller
Billy Eugene Terry
Marvin Roy Williamson
Barbara Rose Winder

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Leonard Max Eddy
Charlie Lou Rouse
*Pat A. Woodrum

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Nellie Keener Buffalomeat
Robert L. Clark, Jr.

OREGON

DELEGATES: LAY
*Larry D. Dalrymple
Nancy Howell McKay
Donald R. Oakes
Clayton Corwin Patrick
Eleanor Mary Rylands

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Marcia Lowell
James G. Maxwell
Kay Holt Salmon

ALTERNATES: LAY
Joy Belle Burgess
Roger Ottomar Sylwester

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Margaret Rogers Thorn

PENNSYLVANIA

DELEGATES: LAY
- Steven Daniel Arbogast
- Kenneth H. Brunjes, Jr.
- John J. Burns
- John Henry Carter
- Richard Walter Cowen
- Don Michael Fadden
- *Leroy Taft Hopkins, Jr.
- Diane C. Katz
- David LeRoy Nohling
- Joseph Rhodes
- Donnan Beeson Runkel
- Mary A. Sandidge
- Helen Segall
- Jule Mills Shipman
- Richard C. Torbert

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
- Keith Doms
- Patricia Ann Head
- George Merritt Jenks
- Sister M. Constance Melvin, I.H.M.
- Sue A. Walker
- Robert L. Wright

ALTERNATES: LAY
- Eugene A. Garvey
- Patricia Kathleen Robinson
- Virginia H. Walsh

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
- Patricia M. Broderick
- Robert N. Case
- Elsie M. Hart

RHODE ISLAND

DELEGATES: LAY
- Robert James Janes
- William Judson LeVeque
- Richard Douglas Plotz
- Joan Ress Reeves

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
- Louise Blalock Dolan
- Diane Gordon Kadanoff
- *The Hon. Victoria Lederberg

ALTERNATES: LAY
- Sam J. LoPresti
- Catherine Hill Stewart

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
- Barbara L. Wilson

SOUTH CAROLINA

DELEGATES: LAY
- James L. Braswell
- Ronald Lynn Copsey
- Lynn Mann Hornsby
- Samuel Bosket Hudson
- Randy Martin LaCross
- *James Robert Martin
- Floyd Lewis Wilcox, Sr.

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
- Catherine Heniford Lewis
- Mary Louise B. McAfee
- F. William Summers

ALTERNATES: LAY
- Katherine Weels Nicholson
- Harmon Hugh Rogers

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
- Betty Elgin Callaham

TENNESSEE

DELEGATES: LAY
- Merlin Lester Cohen
- Barbara E. Mann
- *Rosa Ann Moore
- Thomas Matthews Ritter
- Martha Little Schaeffer
- Richard David Smyser

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
- Frank P. Grisham
- Clementine L. Hamilton
- Mary E. Little
- Anne W. Lowe

ALTERNATES: LAY
- Charles Wann Crawford
- Samuel Jackson Martz

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
- Katheryn C. Culbertson

TEXAS

DELEGATES: LAY
Betty Jane Anderson
Susan Ann Anthony
Felix Arambula, Jr.
Henry Castillo
Alice Faye Davis
Nancy A. Hutchinson
Linnie M. McAdams
Claude Lee Melton
Ivory Edward Moore
*Robert Lee Navarro
Max Ray Sherman
Don Louis Steelman
Kathrine Kirk Wilson
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Lillian Moore Bradshaw
George Augusta Holloway
Zella Mann Lewis
Mary Louise Nieball
Thelma M. Phillips
Sam G. Whitten

ALTERNATES: LAY
Martha T. Caballero
Myra Atwell McDaniel
Cluren L. Richardson
Lennie Coleman Sims
Mrs. E. Carlyle Smith
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Ella A. Hetherington
Harry Robinson, Jr.
Dorman H. Winfrey

UTAH

DELEGATES: LAY
Linda Kay Braithwaite
Jennie L. Hansen
Yukus Y. Inouye
Neila C. Seshachari
Gary Lee Tom
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Russell L. Davis
Anne Clawson Hatch

VIRGINIA

DELEGATES: LAY
Vinod Chachra
John Alexander Chappell, Jr.
Ann Heidbreder Eastman
Harry Mitchell Strong
Calvin Herritage Thigpen
John Thomas Viers
*Mary Frase Williams
Patricia Maria Wright
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Donald Haynes
Fred Milton Heath
Ruth M. Jackson
Carroll Kem Shackelford

ALTERNATES: LAY
Rodney Raphael Akers
Sherry Barber Hatfield
John Samuel Thiemeyer, Jr.
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
H. Gordon Bechanan
Dean Burgess

VERMONT

DELEGATES: LAY
Gerald L. Cassell
*William Walter Pearson
Andre Joseph Senecal
Dorothy Tod
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Sally C. Anderson
Olivia Ramsey Brown

ALTERNATES: LAY
John Andrew Hise, Jr.
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Patricia E. Klinck

WASHINGTON

DELEGATES: LAY
Deborah Elizabeth Cook
The Hon. Karen Riese Fraser
William Thomas Fraser
Millie L. Russell
Frances Lucille Scott
Roy P. Wahle
Robert Yee
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Betty W. Bender
Susan Perry Smith
*John Veblen

ALTERNATES: LAY
Leo B. Blodgett
Elizabeth Jane Pierini
Gary I. Young
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Roderick G. Swartz

WISCONSIN

DELEGATES: LAY
David W. Chang
Jeannette Gregoire Coombs
Noel Westbrooks Dale
Hazel B. Maxwell
Emory Roy Sacho
Ruth Caroline Schmidt
George Neil Theis
Gregory Paul Wagner
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Jenelle Elder
John J. Jax
*James William White
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
W. Lyle Eberhart
Joseph Henry Treyz

WEST VIRGINIA

DELEGATES: LAY
Jean Benish
James E. Casto
Leon Troy Copeland
*Sam Ross Harshbarger
Lewis N. McManus
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Larry J. Frye
Frederic J. Glazer
Ruth Ann Powell

ALTERNATES: LAY
Esther Harte Caddell
Benjamin Preston Clark
ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
Thomas E. Potter

WYOMING

DELEGATES: LAY
Lenore Leigh Diem
David R. Raynolds
Scott Reddington
Denice Wheeler
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Ruby E. Pruitt
*Coralie Walters

AMERICAN SAMOA

DELEGATES: LAY
Faauuga S.L. Achicha
*Trudie Iuli Chun
Faufau S. Faapouli
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Eleanor T. Siavi'i

ALTERNATES: LIBRARY
*Linette Alapa Hunter

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANAS	DELEGATES: LAY *Felipe Q. Atalig Vicente Muna Manglona Maggie Rabauliman Olopai	DELEGATES: LIBRARY Emiliana Sablan Ada ALTERNATES: LIBRARY Augustine C. Castro
GUAM	DELEGATES: LAY Betty Sur Guerrero Pilar C. Lujan Laura Marie Torres Souder	DELEGATES: LIBRARY *Mary Sue Caldwell ALTERNATES: LIBRARY Magdalena S. Taitano
PUERTO RICO	DELEGATES: LAY Rev. Juan Manuel Alers Angeles Pastor Domingo Mas Rivera	DELEGATES: LIBRARY *Carmencita Leon ALTERNATES: LIBRARY Luisa Vigo-Cepeda
TRUST TERRITORY	DELEGATES: LAY Yosiwo P. George Dwight Heine	Valentine Namio Sengebau DELEGATES: LIBRARY Dakio D. Syne
VIRGIN ISLANDS	DELEGATES: LAY James Julian Sealey *Ruby Simmonds Gilbert A. Sprauve	DELEGATES: LIBRARY Charles Alexander Emanuel ALTERNATES: LIBRARY Henry C. Chang
FEDERAL LIBRARY COMMUNITY	DELEGATES: LIBRARY Patricia Wilson Berger Mary A. Huffer	ALTERNATES: LAY Stephen T. Margulis ALTERNATES: LIBRARY Gerald J. Sophar
U.S. INDIANS	DELEGATES: LAY Sister Kateri Cooper Calvin James Isaac Joseph Hurley Sahmaunt	DELEGATES: LIBRARY Cheryl Ann Metoyer-Duran ALTERNATES: LAY Joseph R. Hardy

AT LARGE

DELEGATES: LAY
Geoffrey Francis Aronow
Carole May Bailey
Darcelle Lynn Bailey
James C. Bazor, III
James Robert Beasley
Letha Isabel Berg
Kathleen Lynn Bonk
Seth Borgos
Judy Lee Browder
The Honorable Charles Campbell
Lisa Anne Cobbs
Madeline S. Colliflower
Daniel del Solar
Yvonne Leone Fangmeyer
Elizabeth Jocelyn Feinler
Mark Allen Finkelstein
Leonard Everett Fisher
Timothy Eugene Fry
Nasario Garcia
Richard Lorenzo Garcia
Melinda J. Halpert
Kevin Paul Haynes
Andrew Robert Horowitz
Helen H. Huff
Kenneth Thomas Latta, II
Debbie Lee
Harry Jonas Lerner
Mark David Levinson
Mary Jo Loveland
Jose Manuel Maldonado
Dennis James May
Merrill Alfred Maynard
Eileen Geneva McKenney
Roy H. Millenson
David Emerson Mitchell
Peter Kieron Naiman
Kathleen Nolan
Layton E. Olson
David Bernard Ouellette
Frank Robert Paulsen
Lindsay Veronica Potts
Douglas Ray Robinson
Marcus D. Salazar
Anita Louise Sanchez
Charles Henry Sanson
J. Eric Seaborg
Nina Serrano
Mitchell Evan Schapiro
Michael Steven Sher
Janet Cumming Smalley
Daniel C. Smith
Stephen David Solomon
Jeff Neil Strack
Benedict J. Tafoya
LeRoy Marcel Tavares
Andrew Edwin Turner
Brigid Rowan Vance
Margaret R. Walter
Jane Sue Wassam
Craig R. Wyss

DELEGATES: LIBRARY
Pedro Rosario Alvarez
Evangeline (Becky) Harrison Anderson
James John Beilman
David R. Bender
Juanita S. Brightwell
Theodore Charles Christman, Jr.
Barbara Faye Eaton
Michael J. Flores
Annamary Giagni
Laura S. Goodman
Alice L. Hagemeyer
Rose Helen Jones
E.J. Josey
Michael Tyree Klepper
Esther W. Lopato
Robert Arthur McCown
Joan Skipper Roberts
Kathy Juanita Roe
Solomon Rosenbaum
Whitney North Seymour, Jr.
Margaret Earlene Sites
Carolyn R. Skidmore
Marjorie G. Stern
Maria E. Torres
Arnulfo Duenes Trejo
John Karl Waiblinger
Edward LaRue Weldon
Douglas Albert Whitaker
Doris Keren Yaffey
Ling Yu

AT LARGE — ASSOCIATIONS

DELEGATES: LAY
Robert Freeman Asleson
DELEGATES: LIBRARY
LeMoyne W. Anderson
Connie Edward Bolden

The White House Conference Advisory Committee

MEMBERS

Charles Benton (Chairman)
Wilmette, Illinois

Bessie Boehm Moore
(Vice-Chairman)
Little Rock, Arkansas

Gregory H. Adamian
President
Bentley College
Waltham, Massachusetts

C.E. Campbell Beall
Chairman
West Virginia Library Commission
Martinsburg, West Virginia

Rebecca T. Bingham
Director of Library Media Services
Jefferson County Public Schools
Louisville, Kentucky

Robert Lee Chartrand
Senior Specialist in Information Sciences Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service
Washington, D.C.

Shirley Echelman
Executive Director
Medical Library Association
Chicago, Illinois

The Honorable William D. Ford
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Marian G. Gallagher
Professor of Law and Law Librarian
Law Library, University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Robert M. Hayes
Dean, Graduate School of Library and Information Science
University of California Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Esther Mae Henke
Director of the Library Services Branch
Oklahoma Department of Libraries
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Warren Gardiner Hill
Executive Director
Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado

Alice B. Ihrig
Director of Civic and Cultural Programs
Moraine Valley Community College, Community Services
Palos Hills, Illinois

The Honorable Jacob K. Javits
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

Nicholas Johnson
Chairman
National Citizens Communications Lobby
Washington, D.C.

Rose Marie Lopez
Bilingual Teacher
Phoenix Elementary School District
Phoenix, Arizona

Michael A. McCarroll
Vice President
D.C. Heath Co.
Lexington, Massachusetts

Margaret C. McNamara
Chairman of the Board and Founder
Reading is Fundamental, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Edward J. Meade, Jr.
Program Officer
Education and Research, The Ford Foundation
New York, New York

Helen H. Meyer
Editorial Consultant
Doubleday and Company
New York, New York

John T. Short
Regional Manager for the Eastern United States
Coronet Media, Division of Esquire, Inc.
Avon, Conneticut

Joseph F. Shubert
State Librarian
New York State Library
Albany, New York

Jeanne Hurley Simon
Legislative Specialist
National Advisory Council on
Womens Educational Programs
Washington, D.C.

Philip A. Sprague
Associate Administrator for
Management Assistance
United States Small Business
Administration
Washington, D.C.

Carlton J. Thaxton
Director of the Division of
Public Library Services
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

John E. Velde, Jr.
Investor
Hollywood, California

Margaret S. Warden
Former Montana State Senator
Great Falls, Montana

Virginia G. Young
The Coordinating Board for
Higher Education
Columbia, Missouri

FORMER MEMBERS

Frederick H. Burkhardt
(Chairman Emeritus)
John H.M. Chen
Walter W. Curley
Ann Heidbreder Eastman
Oscar C. Everhart
David R. Gergen
Donald T. Gibbs
Kenneth Jernigan
Louis A. Lerner
Allie Beth Martin
Samuel Jackson Martz
Justin McDevitt
Agnes M. Myers
Edwin B. Parker
J.C. Redd
Elizabeth F. Ruffner
Gene Shalit
Martha S. Williams

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

MEMBERS

Charles Benton (Chairman)
Wilmette, Illinois

Bessie Boehm Moore
(Vice-Chairman)
Little Rock, Arkansas

Helmut Alpers
Vice President
General Bookbinding Company
Chesterland, Ohio

****Joseph Becker**
President
Becker and Hayes
Santa Monica, California

Daniel J. Boorstin
The Librarian of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Robert W. Burns, Jr.
Assistant Director of Libraries for Research Services
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

Carlos A. Cuadra
President
Cuadra Associates
Santa Monica, California

Joan H. Gross
Public Affairs Officer
United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
New York, New York

Clara S. Jones
Former Director
Detroit Public Library
Oakland, California

Francis Keppel
Director
Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Marian P. Leith
Assistant Director and Federal Program Director State Library
Raleigh, North Carolina

Frances H. Naftalin
President
Minneapolis Public Library Board
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Philip A. Sprague
Associate Administrator for Management Assistance
United States Small Business Administration
Washington, D.C.

Horace E. Tate
Executive Director
Georgia Association of Educators
Decatur, Georgia

****John E. Velde, Jr.**
Investor
Hollywood, California

Margaret S. Warden
Former Montana State Senator
Great Falls, Montana

†**William J. Welsh**
The Deputy Librarian of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Mildred E. Younger
Former Member
Los Angeles City Library Commission
Los Angeles, California

FORMER MEMBERS

Andrew A. Aines
William O. Baker
Frederick H. Burkhardt
(Chairman Emeritus)
Daniel W. Casey
Harold C. Crotty
Leslie W. Dunlap
Martin Goland
John G. Kemeny
Louis A. Lerner
John G. Lorenz
L. Quincy Mumford
Ralph A. Renick
Catherine D. Scott
Julia Li Wu
Alfred R. Zipf

**Term expired in July 1979. Served in consulting capacity during the Conference and until February 1980.

†Serves in the absence of The Librarian of Congress

681

THE COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE

MEMBERS

Gordon M. Ambach
Commissioner of Education
State of New York
Albany, New York

Robert Michael Braude
Senior Vice President and Executive
Library of Medicine
University of Nebraska
Omaha, Nebraska

Howard W. Dillon
Associate Director
The University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois

Duane F. Johnson
Librarian
Hutchinson Public Library
Hutchinson, Kansas

Janet Risha London
State Director
Literacy Volunteers of MA
Worcester, Massachusetts

Nancy M. Lorenzi
Director
U.C. Medical Center Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio

Delia E. Martinez
Senior Budget Analyst/System
Equal Opportunity Office
University of Nevada System
Reno, Nevada

Robert Lee Navarro
President
Hispanic International University
Houston, Texas

William Walter Pearson
Senior Associate (Lawyer)
Downs, Rachun, and Martin
Hardwick, Vermont

Marcus D. Salazar
Project Director
Neighborhood Services Organization
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

The Information Community Advisory Committee

MEMBERS

Robert Lee Chartrand
Co-chairman
Senior Specialist in Information Sciences
Library of Congress,
Congressional Research Service

Robert B. Pfannkuch
Co-chairman
Corporate Vice President and President, Video Group
Bell and Howell Company
Chicago, Illinois

James B. Adler
President
Congressional Information Services, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Robert S. Arthur
Director of Business Data Bases
Control Data Corporation
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Jason S. Berman
Warner Communications
Washington, D.C.

J. Christopher Burns
Vice President, Planning
The Washington Post
Washington, D.C.

Daniel H. Carter
Manager of Advanced Business Planning
Texas Instrument, Inc.
Houston, Texas

Anne Cheatham
Director
Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future
Washington, D.C.

Warren Cole
Director, National Accounts
Eastman Kodak Company
Rochester, New York

Robert Colten
Director of Productivity Systems Planning
Tymshare, Incorporated
Cupertino, California

Marilyn Courtot
Administrative Director
Office of the Secretary of the United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

Alex S. Edelstein
Professor and Director
University of Washington
School of Communications
Seattle, Washington

John Eger
Attorney and Consultant on Communications Law
Washington, D.C.

Donald T. Gibbs
Librarian
Redwood Library and Athenaeum
Newport, Rhode Island

Vincent Giuliano
Senior Staff Consultant
Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Mary Gardiner Jones
Vice President for Consumer Affairs
Western Union Telegraph Company
Washington, D.C.

Kas Kalba
President
Kalba Bowen Associates, Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dan Lacy
Senior Vice President
McGraw-Hill, Inc.
New York, New York

James H. McCain
Publisher
Information World
Arlington, Virginia

Roy Millenson
Staff Director, College Division and Library Information
Association of American Publishers
Washington, D.C.

Anthony G. Oettinger
Chairman, Program on Information Resources Policy
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Marc Porat
Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies
Washington, D.C.

683

William J. Senter
President
Xerox Publishing Group
Greenwich, Connecticut

Wendell Shackelford
President
Media Matrix, Inc.
New York, New York

Delbert C. Staley
President
New York Telephone Company
New York, New York

Donald N. Streeter
Director of Technical Communications
IBM Corporation
Armonk, New York

Ken Winslow
Manager of Video Program Services
Public Broadcasting Service
Washington, D.C.

Barry Zorthian
President
Washington/Baltimore Regional Association
Washington, D.C.

Paul G. Zurkowski
President
Information Industry Association
Washington, D.C.

684

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries

MEMBERS

Douglas M. Knight (Chairman)
Frederick H. Burkhardt (Vice Chairman)
Estelle Brodman
Launor F. Carter
***Verner W. Clapp**
Carl Elliott
Alvin C. Eurich
Mildred P. Frary
Herman H. Fussler
Marian G. Gallagher
Emerson Greenaway
Caryl P. Haskins
William N. Hubbard, Jr.
Dan Lacy
Bessie Boehm Moore
Carl F.J. Overhage
***Harry H. Ransom**
Wilbur L. Schramm
***Mrs. George Rodney Wallace**
Stephen J. Wright

The Advisory Commission was established in September 1966 and completed its work in July 1968. Its major recommendation called for the establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and information Science, a permanent, independent Federal agency.

---

*Deceased

685

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services

STAFF MEMBERS

Marilyn K. Gell
Executive Director

Jerry Manolatos
Deputy Director

Richard G. Akeroyd, Jr.
Coordinator, Information Center and Audiovisual Programs

Elaine Brock
Clerk-typist

Dorothy S. Burgess
Secretary to Program Coordinator

K.C. Chartrand
Staff Artist

John Cohrssen
Legal Counsel

Elaine Cooke
Secretary-Receptionist

Amado Cruz, Jr.
Travel/Accounting Clerk

Charles Culhane
Program Editor

Ben DeWhitt
Staff Consultant, National Archives

Jack Duncan
Legislative Consultant

Barbara Fisher
Secretary

Kelvin V. Hackett
Budget Clerk

Vera Hirschberg
Public Affairs Coordinator

Mary Louise Huchs
Assistant to Volunteers Coordinator

Barry Jagoda
Coordinator, Information Community Advisory Commission

Mary Jones
Executive Assistant to the Director

John C. Katz
Editorial Assistant

Linda Lang
Volunteers Coordinator

Thomas G. Lennox
Managing Editor

Anita Lindsley
Word Processing Specialist

Hector Lujan
Computer Services Assistant

Peggy McLaughlin
Writer-Editor

Loretto Love Meriwether
Public Affairs Assistant

Heather L. Nicoll
Coordinator for Systems and Publications

Barbara Patterson
Computer Services Specialist

Kathleen Quinn
Word Processing Specialist

Robert W. Rector
Special Assistant, Information Center

Melinda Renner
Staff Assistant

Lynn Roefs
Assistant to Volunteers Coordinator

Amanda Seward
Staff Assistant

Eileen E. Shaw
International Planning Assistant

Billie Simpson
Secretary/Assistant to Program Coordinator

Janet Smalley
International Planning Assistant

Kathleen Salata Smith
International Planning Coordinator

Jean-Anne South
Program Coordinator

Paula Valerie Taylor
Word Processing Specialist

Betsy Thom
Assistant to Volunteers Coordinator

Chad Evans Wyatt
Staff Photographer

Shelley R. Zuniga
Word Processing Specialist

FORMER STAFF

Kevin C. Flaherty
Program and Planning Consultant

Ronald Linehan
Program and Planning Consultant

Mary R. Power
Program and Planning Consultant

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

STAFF MEMBERS

Alphonse F. Trezza
Executive Director

Douglas S. Price
Deputy Director

Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar
Associate Director and Liaison to the Conference

Martha D. Quigley
Secretary

Carl C. Thompson
Administrative Assistant

Ruth Liepmann Tighe
Research Associate

Barbara L. Whiteleather
Executive Secretary

Ruby O. Woods-Robinson
Research Associate

***William D. Mathews**
Research Associate

---

*Former member of staff.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services: Rules

Adopted November 16, 1979

Section 1—Definitions of terms used as established by P.L. 91-345, July 20, 1970 and P.L. 93-568, December 31, 1974.

(a) "Commission" means the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, established by P.L. 91-345, July 20, 1970.

(b) "Advisory Committee" means the Advisory Committee of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services which is composed of 28 members: three designated by the Chairman of the Commission; five designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (with no more than three being members of the House of Representatives); five designated by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate (with no more than three being members of the Senate); and not more than fifteen appointed by the President. The advisory Committee assists and advises the Commission in planning and conducting the White House Conference on Library and Information Services in accordance with P.L. 93-568, December 31, 1974.

(c) "Conference" means the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, to be organized and convened by the Commission in accordance with P.L. 93-568.

(d) "Planning committees" mean the planning committees in each State and territory designated by the Commission to organize and conduct a pre-White House Conference in each State and territory in preparation for the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

(e) "States" include the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territories, Northern Mariana Islands, American Indians on or near Reservations, Federal Librarians, and the Virgin Islands, unless otherwise specified.

(f) "State meetings" mean the meetings organized and conducted in each State by the planning committees in preparation for the Conference.

(g) "Act" means P.L. 93-568, December 31, 1974.

(h) "General sessions" refer to the meetings which will be held at the following times:

Session I	November 15, evening.
Session II	November 15, evening (RULES)
Session III	November 16, morning.
Session IV	November 18, afternoon.
Session V	November 19, morning.

(i) "Theme Sessions" refer to the five concurrent meetings of Delegates assigned to issues within a given theme. These meetings are to be held at the following times:

Session I	November 17, evening.
Session II	November 18, morning.

(j) "Small Work Groups" refer to the work sessions of Delegates assigned by issues within the Conference Themes.

(k) "Open Hearings" refer to those sessions during which non-Delegates are invited to present testimony to a panel of the Commission's designation. These Open Hearings are to be held at the following times:

I November 16, afternoon.
II November 17, morning.
III November 17, afternoon.

(l) "Delegates" mean

(a) Individuals selected or elected through a process determined by those planning committees in each State and territory designated by the Commission to conduct the State and territory pre-White House Conferences.

(b) Individuals selected as Delegates-at-large in accordance with Commission policies and procedures.

(m) "Alternates" mean those individuals selected by the States as Official Alternates to their Delegates. This status does not confer voting and other Delegate rights.

(n) "Official Observers" mean those individuals representing organizations, agencies, or groups invited to attend the Conference. This status does not confer voting and other Delegate rights.

(o) "Observers" mean those individuals who have no official function or role at the Conference but who have come to the Conference and have registered as observers.

(p) "Facilitators" mean those individuals who have been invited as disinterested persons to assist the Delegates in their Small Work Groups. These individuals have agreed to participate in special training for facilitating the work of the Delegates in their Small Group Sessions. Facilitators have no voice or vote in the resolution-making process of the Delegates.

(q) "Moderators—General Session" mean those non-Delegate/Alternate individuals who have been selected, and who have agreed, to chair the Delegates in their General Session deliberations and voting.

(r) "Moderators—Theme Session" mean those non-Delegate/Alternate individuals who have been selected, and who have agreed to chair the Delegates in their Theme Session deliberations and voting.

(s) "Recorders" mean those non-Delegate/Alternate individuals who have been assigned as staff to each Delegate Work Group to record that group's deliberations and resolutions.

(t) "Recording Secretaries—Theme Sessions, Open Hearings, and General Sessions" mean those individuals assigned to keep track of the proceedings of those sessions, and to provide accurate summaries of those sessions for further use by the Delegates.

(u) "Staff" means the White House Conference staff and the staff to the Conference provided under contract by KAPPA Systems.

(v) "Volunteers" mean those individuals who have offered their services to assist in the work of the Conference.

(w) "Special Guests" mean those other individuals who have been invited to attend all or parts of the Conference in recognition of their key roles in the history of the Conference and the future of the Conference recommendations.

(x) "Chair" means the Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science who is also Chairman of the White House Conference Advisory Committee.

(y) "Credentials Committee" means those members of the Commission and the Advisory Committee authorized to certify Official Alternates as Delegates in the event that persons from the States previously certified as voting Delegates are unable to participate in the Conference, and to adjudicate any registration difficulties.

(z) "Rules Committee" means those members of the Commission and the Advisory Committee assigned to assist Delegates in interpreting the Conference Rules.

Section 2—Words importing gender.

As used in these rules, unless the context requires a different meaning, all words importing the masculine gender include both masculine and feminine genders.

Section 3—Open hearings process.

3.1	Call to Conference.
3.2	Purpose of opening hearings.
3.3	Panel.
3.4	Identification.
3.5	Registration for Conference sessions.
3.6	Requirements.
3.7	Timekeepers.
3.8	Process.
3.8.1	Scheduling.
3.8.2	Length of presentation.
3.8.3	Questions.

3.8.4	Place in White House Conference as a whole.
3.8.5	Eligibility.
3.8.6	Deadline for scheduling testimony.
3.8.7	Unscheduled testimony.
3.8.8	Minutes.
3.9	Parliamentary authority.
3.10	Conference officials.

3.1 Call to Conference

The Commission shall determine the time, place and the agenda of the Conference and shall issue official notice thereof to the Chair, to the State Library Agency heads of each State, to all Delegates, and to the general public.

3.2 Purpose of open hearings.

The purpose of the open hearings is to provide an opportunity for groups or special interests to state their concerns, to maintain the openness of the Conference to the general public, and to offer an opportunity for conflicting or contrasting opinions to be heard.

3.3 Panel.

Panels for each open hearing shall consist of members of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, or such other individuals as the Commission shall designate for this purpose.

3.4 Indentification.

All participants involved in open hearing sessions shall wear identification badges. Badges shall not be transferable and they shall be visible at all meetings.

3.5 Registration for Conference sessions.

All persons (including press) who intend to testify before the open hearings sessions shall comply with Conference registration requirements including registering with name, address, identification, and payment of any required fee. Upon compliance with registration requirements, each registrant shall be issued an identification badge as delegate at large, special guest, observer, alternate, press, staff, discussion leader, resource person, or recorder.

3.6 Requirements.

All individuals who desire to pre-file for the open hearings in conjunction with the White House Conference shall be required to fulfill the following:

3.6.1 Statement of intent.

Each individual or group that desires to present a position to the open hearings shall file a statement of intent to present such testimony. In the case of a group, representation of a statement shall be accompanied by notarized proof of authorization.

3.6.2 Abstract.

Each participant who pre-files for open hearing sessions shall provide an abstract no more than one page, 8½ by 11, to include the topic area to be addressed, issues to be raised, a statement of a position taken, and any recommendations which are to be included in the presentation.

3.6.3 Paper.

Each individual who pre-registers to speak at the open hearings shall submit, to the White House Conference staff in advance of the Conference, a paper which expresses that position. This paper should be no longer than 10 pages in length, double spaced on 8½ by 11. The author of the paper and/or organization represented should be clearly indicated on each page of the submitted testimony. The format of the paper should follow the outline as indicated above in 3.6.2.

3.7 Timekeepers.

Timekeepers shall be present at all sessions of the Conference. Their duty shall be to indicate to each speaker an appropriate warning before expiration of the allowed time.

3.8 Process.

The process of the open hearings shall be governed by the procedures enumerated below:

3.8.1 Scheduling.

All individuals who have pre-filed their statement of intent to testify at the open hearings by the deadline of October 1, 1979 shall be scheduled at one of the open hearing sessions of the Conference.

3.8.2 Length of presentation.

Each individual who has been duly registered and scheduled for a presentation at the open hearing shall have a maximum of five minutes to summarize his or her presentation. Participants will be held to this time period by the Conference timekeepers.

3.8.3 Questions/Clarifications

Members of the panel shall have the option to ask the participant questions for clarification of the positions or recommendations proposed. Such questioning shall be at the discretion of the presiding officer.

3.8.4 Place of open hearing sessions in White House Conference process.

The open hearings will be an integral part of the White House Conference. There will be recorders to summarize important positions, points, or opinions expressed during the open hearing sessions. These summaries will be published in official record of the White House Conference and brought to the attention of the appropriate Recommendations Committee of the White House Conference for consideration.

3.8.5 Eligibility.

(a) Any association, agency, individual or group may participate in the open hearings in accordance with the requirements as stated in 3.6.

(b) Any duly registered observer at the White House Conference shall be permitted to participate in the open hearing sessions in accordance with procedures enumerated in 3.8.7 below.

3.8.6 Deadline for scheduling testimony.

All participants who desire to pre-register for the open hearing sessions shall file all items specified under Requirements, 3.6, by October 1, 1979.

3.8.7 Unscheduled testimony.

The open hearing sessions shall be scheduled to allow time at the end of each scheduled hearing for presentations by those duly registered Conference participants who have not pre-filed their intent to testify at the open hearing sessions. These participants will be allowed to testify to the open hearings panels on a first-come basis after registering with the secretary for the open hearing sessions. The secretary shall provide to the presiding officer, one-half hour prior to the end of each open hearing session, a list of those individuals who have signed in with him or her and who have provided the necessary abstract and paper as detailed in item 3.6, Requirements.

3.8.8 Minutes.

The recording secretary(s) shall be responsible for the preparation of the official minutes of all open hearings. Tape recordings shall be provided for all open hearing sessions discussions to aid in the preparation of accurate minutes or summaries by this designated recorder(s). Minutes shall be approved by the presiding officers of these session(s) and by the Chairman of the Commission or his delegates.

3.9 Parliamentary authority.

(a) The rules in *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* shall govern all open hearing sessions of the Conference in all cases applicable, when not inconsistent with the White House Conference rules.

(b) The format, agenda, order of business, and seating arrangements of the Conference open hearing sessions shall be determined in all cases by the Commission.

3.10 Open hearing officials.

At each open hearing session there shall be in attendance a presiding officer and assistant presiding officer, Federal officer appointed pursuant to the requirements in the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the chair of the Rules Committee or his or her designee, the chair or co-chair of the Recommendations Committee, the chair of the Credentials Committee or his designee, Conference Parliamentarian, timekeepers, recording secretary(s) and credentials monitors. Presiding officers of each open hearing session shall be appointed by the Commission.

Section 4—Conference process.

4.1 Call to Conference.
4.2 Voting body.
4.3 No proxy voting.
4.4 Method of voting.
4.5 Identification.
4.6 Registration for Conference sessions.
4.7 Order of business.
4.8 Designated seating.
4.9 Quorum.
4.10 Adoption of rules.
4.11 Discussion and debate.
4.12 Making motions.

4.13 Credentials Committee.
4.14 Timekeepers.
4.15 Floor tellers.
4.16 Resolutions Committees.
4.17 Parliamentary authority.
4.18 Rules Committee.
4.19 Minutes.
4.20 Conference officials
4.21 Committee of the Conference.

4.1 Call to Conference.

The Commission shall determine the time, place, format and the agenda of the Conference and shall issue official notice thereof to the State Library Agency Heads of each State, to all Delegates, and to the general public.

4.2 Voting body.

The voting body of the Conference shall consist of the following voting Delegates:

(a) State Delegates certified as having been duly selected as a part of State or territorial pre-Conferences in accordance with applicable regulations (reference to *Advisory Memo Number 1, Delegate Determination*).

(b) One hundred and five (105) additional Delegates-at-large designated by the Commission as deemed necessary and appropriate to fill the requirements of P.L. 93-568, S.J. Res. 40 (a) (2), December 31, 1974.

(c) Alternate State Delegates who have been properly certified in one of the following two ways:

(1) If the Commission receives proper notification by November 1, 1979 that a State Delegate is unable to attend, the ranking Alternate selected at the State pre-White House Conference will be permanently certified by the Commission as a State Delegate; or

(2) At the Conference, the Chair of the affected State delegation may notify the Credentials Committee of a Delegate's inability to attend. Upon such notification, the Credentials Committee will then certify the appropriate ranking alternate Delegate present at the Conference as a Delegate for the State.

(3) In implementing the aforementioned rules, the following principles shall be controlling:

(i) Every effort will be made to ensure that the two-thirds non-library-related to one-third library-related balance of the Conference be maintained.

(ii) An Alternate has no right to participate as a voting Delegate unless properly certified pursuant to paragraph (c) (1) or (2) of this section.

(iii) There shall be no alternate Delegates for Delegates-at-large to the Conference.

4.3 No proxy voting.

There shall be no proxy voting.

4.4 Method of voting—Theme and General Sessions.

No individual shall have more than one vote. The regular method of voting shall be by Voting Credential, Paper Ballot, and automated voting mechanisms. Two-thirds vote of those present and voting shall be required in order to overrule any ruling of the moderator. Secret ballots or roll call votes shall be by a two-thirds vote of the Delegates.

4.5 Identification.

All voting Delegates and all alternates shall have identification badges.

4.6 Registration for Conference sessions.

All persons who attend any Conference sessions (including press) must comply with registration requirements, including registration with name, address, identification, and payment of any required fee for meal functions. Upon compliance with registration requirements, each registrant shall be issued an identification badge as Delegate, Alternate, official observer, observer, press, staff, facilitator, moderator, or recorder, etc. Badges shall not be transferable and they must be visible at all meetings. Badges altered in any fashion shall be deemed illegal.

4.7 Order of Business.

The Commission shall establish the order of business for the Conference when it issues the Call to the Conference according to 4.1, which shall be published in *The Federal Register* as procedurally demanded. New business may be submitted and adopted in accordance with 4.7.1.

4.7.1 New business.

Proposals for the consideration of subject matter not embraced within the established order of business of the

Conference may be brought up under the heading of new business at a general voting session of the Delegates (see Definitions), by a petition signed by 100 voting Delegates, presented to the Chair of the Conference 12 hours before the beginning of the final General Session. Any such new business shall also be submitted to the recording secretary, in writing, at least twelve hours prior to the beginning of the last General Session. A two-thirds vote of those voting Delegates present shall be required to consider such new business.

4.8 Designated seating.

Separate seating spaces shall be provided and clearly designated as follows (not in order of preference): (a) Current and past Commission members and Advisory Committee members; (b) State Delegates and Delegates-at-large; (c) Alternate State Delegates; (d) Special guests; (e) Official observers; (f) Conference staff; (g) Duly registered press; and (h) Duly registered observers to the capacity of the meeting rooms.

Only persons wearing appropriate badges shall be admitted to any session by the Credentials monitors, and only to those designated areas and at designated times in accordance with procedures established by the Commission and the Credentials Committee. Only voting Delegates, authorized media personnel, and authorized Commission, Advisory Committee, or Conference staff shall be admitted to the Delegate arena for general Conference sessions.

4.9 Quorum—Theme and General Sessions.

Two-thirds of the duly registered voting Delegates shall constitute a quorum for all general voting sessions.

4.9.1 Two-thirds of the duly registered voting Delegates assigned to Theme Sessions or to Work Group Sessions shall constitute a quorum for these sessions.

4.10 Adoption of rules.

In accordance with 4.9, an affirmative vote by a simple majority of all voting Delegates present shall be required for adoption of Conference rules.

4.10.1 Amendments to rules.

All suggested amendments to the adoption of the proposed rules shall be presented in writing to the Chair of the Conference five hours prior to the first general session of the Conference. A two-thirds majority vote of the Delegates present (who must constitute a quorum) shall be required for an amendment to the Conference rules. All discussion and debate on the adoption of rules shall be governed by the requirements as stated in 4.11.

4.11 Discussion and debate in Theme and General Sessions (all subject to quorum requirements).

(a) In order to address the Conference, a voting Delegate must address the moderator, await recognition, give name and identification, and state whether speaking in the affirmative or the negative.

(b) Discussion on a motion or agenda topic shall be limited to three minutes for each speaker.

(c) No individual may speak a second time on an issue until all others who wish to speak have had an opportunity to do so.

(d) Debate may be limited or terminated by a majority vote of those voting Delegates present and voting.

(e) By a simple majority vote of Delegates present, a person other than a voting Delegate may be permitted to speak in clarification of an issue during Conference debate.

4.12 Making motions.

(a) Only properly certified voting Delegates may speak to issues, make motions or vote. All motions, on substantive matters, shall be written and signed by the person who makes the motion; the moderators may require such written motions before action is taken.

(b) A two-thirds vote of those authorized voting Delegates who are present and voting shall be required to table, or to postpone indenfinitely, or to object to consideration.

4.13 Credentials Committee.

The Credentials Committee shall report registration to the Conference upon request of the Chair. An updated pre-registration list of State Delegates and Alternates and of Delegates-at-large shall be provided to the chair of the Credentials Committee prior to the opening of Conference registration.

4.13.1 Decorum.

(a) No registrant will be permitted to obstruct the view or hearing of any other registrant by any device. Only persons authorized by the Commission shall be permitted to bring any electronic or sonic device (e.g., citizens' band radio) into the Conference. Any person violating these rules may be denied all Conference privileges and removed from the Conference.

(b) Any registrant may be requested at any time to provide additional identification. Any registrant who lacks appropriate identification, or abuses any Conference privilege, or obstructs the orderly conduct of the Conference may be denied any or all Conference privileges.

(c) The Conference shall have available sergeants-at-arms and credentials monitors as necessary to assist in the enforcement of the rules of the Conference at any or all of the Conference sessions.

4.14 Timekeepers.

Timekeepers shall serve at all sessions. Their duty shall be to indicate to each speaker an appropriate warning before expiration of the allowed time.

4.15 Floor tellers.

(a) At theme sessions, floor tellers shall be available to count and report votes. The floor tellers shall be assigned to definite sections of the Conference floor. A record of the vote shall be entered in the minutes. During a vote count, only floor tellers shall be permitted to move about. All other persons except voting Delegates shall leave the voting area.

4.16 Resolutions Committee.

There shall be Conference Resolutions Committees, whose membership shall consist of Delegate representatives elected by each small working group.

4.16.1 Theme Resolutions Committees.

The membership of the Resolutions Committee shall be divided into five theme areas, and each of these five groups shall consist of one elected Delegate from each of the small work groups in that theme. In addition, there shall be a theme moderator. It shall be the duty of each theme moderator to meet with the elected Delegates from each of the small working groups within his/her theme area, to discuss the order of presentation by those Delegates of the priority (five to eight) resolutions from their respective work groups during the first theme session of the Conference. At the theme sessions, which shall be attended by all Delegates to the small working groups in the relevant theme area, all resolutions from the small work groups will be voted on by the Delegates and the top priority resolutions for each theme area from among the small work groups' resolutions will be forwarded to the general voting session for vote. The number of resolutions shall be limited to 34, assigned by the number of small work groups in each theme.

4.16.2 General Resolutions Committee.

The membership of the General Resolutions Committee shall consist of Delegates elected in the following manner: two from each of the Theme Resolutions Committees. In addition, there shall be a General Session Moderator to meet with the elected Delegates from each of the Theme Resolutions Committees to discuss the order of presentation by those Delegates of the priority resolutions from each of the Theme Sessions. The number of resolutions shall be limited to 34, assigned by the number of small work groups in each theme, as stated in 4.16.1 above. The General Resolutions Committee will consider all theme resolutions; and those resolutions which were not voted by the individual theme sessions as top priority, and which were not incorporated into the top priority resolutions—as determined by the full Resolutions Committee—will be placed on a paper ballot for affirmative or negative vote by the entire voting Delegate body.

4.17 Parliamentary authority.

(a) The Commission shall appoint the parliamentarians who shall be advisors to the facilitators of working groups, and moderators of theme sessions, and general sessions. The rules in *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* shall govern all sessions of the Conference in all cases not covered by these rules.

(b) Any questions regarding the interpretation of these rules shall be resolved by the Moderator of the Conference session in consultation with the Conference Parliamentarian, subject to appeal by Delegates under *Robert's Rules*.

4.18 Rules Committee.

Any Delegate questions of interpreting the Conference Rules between general sessions shall be handled by the Rules Committee, assisted by an official Conference Paliamentarian.

4.19 Minutes.

The recording secretary(s), who shall be appointed by the Commission, shall be responsible for the preparation of the official minutes of all theme and general sessions and open hearings. Tape recordings shall be provided for all general session discussions to aid in the preparation of accurate minutes by the designated recorder(s). Minutes shall be approved by the moderators of the appropriate session(s) and by the Chair of the Commission or his designate.

4.20 Conference officials.

At each general session, there shall be in attendance a moderator, Federal officer appointed pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, chair of the Rules Committee or his designee, the chair and co-chair of the Resolutions Committee (as elected by the Delegates), the chair of the Credentials Committee or his designee, an official Conference Parliamentarian, timekeepers, tellers, recording secretary(s), and credentials monitors. The moderators for general sessions shall be appointed by the Commission.

4.21 Committee of the Conference.

The General Resolutions Committee shall be the Committee of the Conference which will take steps to provide for the accurate reporting of the proceedings and recommendations of the Conference, as well as take responsibility for any procedures relating to future convening of another White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Resolutions Not Passed by Delegates

The following resolutions were proposed to delegates to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services but did not pass. They include two general resolutions which failed after they were brought forward by the Resolutions Committee, four paper ballot resolutions which did not pass, and 20 petition resolutions which did not gain the two-thirds vote necessary for the delegates to consider them.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS

The following two resolutions were brought by the Resolutions Committee to the final voting session of the Conference on Monday, November 19, 1979, but failed to pass.

The Library of Congress and National Planning

WHEREAS, all types of publicly funded libraries should be designated as resources for publicly produced and privately produced information and vehicles for dissemination and assistance in the use of this information, and

WHEREAS, all levels of government should be responsible for assuring this right,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Congress designate the Library of Congress to provide leadership in the development of plans for such services as a national depository for all governmental publications, a national periodicals center, a national referral center, and a national library network, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State library agencies be designated as integral participants in the planning and development of national services and as leaders in the planning of State and local services.

Lifelong Learning

WHEREAS, in order to enhance informal lifelong learning for all persons without regard to age, race, religion or other handicap condition, and

WHEREAS, local and State agencies, libraries and other educational institutions have a specific and vital role in serving the lifelong learning need of all people,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, libraries together with those other agencies and institutions should work cooperatively to provide the resources and services that will enable all our people to take advantage of opportunities available to them, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that programs be developed that create a climate for cultural, educational and practical use in response to community needs.

PAPER BALLOTS

The four resolutions that follow were submitted to the delegates by paper ballot but failed to pass.

Subsidizing the Use of Technology

WHEREAS, we affirm the concept of information as a public utility. We believe that information, in any form, should be made available to all.

BE IT RESOLVED, that it is the right of all people to have access to technological development as it relates to publicly funded library services, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a special Federal fund be created to subsidize library users of commercial machines, computer hardware and software and other data-based systems.

Local Library Commissions

BE IT RESOLVED, that Federal or State governments set up local advisory (county or regional) commissions on libraries and information services composed of lay and professional persons.

User Fees

WHEREAS, the topic of user fees to be charged by libraries to their patrons is a highly debatable question in this period of library development,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the question of user fees and all of its ramifications to libraries of all types and to their patrons be investigated through proper research methods and the results of this study be made available to all libraries so that service to all people be equitable and fair, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the funding for such a study be undertaken by the American Library Association and/or State library agencies and the United States Department of Education.

Vandalism and Theft

WHEREAS, library losses due to theft are a serious national problem, and

WHEREAS, these losses cause expenditures of large amounts of money that could be used to provide library services that would meet the personal needs of individuals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that there be a special program within the American Library Association that would be responsible for the following:

1) gathering and making available all information relating to library losses and their prevention.
2) providing grants for various types of research and demonstration projects, which would help to decrease the incidence of theft and vandalism.

PETITION RESOLUTIONS

The 20 resolutions that follow are petition resolutions which failed to gain the two-thirds vote needed for the delegates to the Conference to consider them. Careful study of these resolutions will show that in many cases the intent of some of these already was included in resolutions previously adopted by the delegates.

Assistant Secretary for Libraries

WHEREAS, the library, through the ages has been and continues to be the storehouse of the world's knowledge, and

WHEREAS, the library, in this historical context is central to the humanization of man, and

WHEREAS, the library, here in these United States is the core of intellectual and social freedom and economic salvation,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the library in America be given a predominant presence everywhere in the nation by the creation of an Assistant Secretary for Libraries in the Department of Education.

Information Policies

BE IT RESOLVED, that this Conference recognizes the urgent need to formulate information policies for the people of the United States and charges the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to consult with other agencies and organizations to formulate such policies and propose necessary legislative action.

Needs of Ethnic Groups

WHEREAS, the ethnic populations in America represent an enormous potential source for library patronage, and

WHEREAS, there is no Federal library legislation addressed specifically and directly to the need for library services to ethnic populations, and

WHEREAS, libraries have much to offer by way of servicing and programming which could contribute to the recognition of these diverse groups and to the concept of ethnic pluralism, and

WHEREAS, these ethnic groups should be brought into the library orbit as library users so that they may in turn come to the support of libraries around budget time, and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to develop cooperation among community-based ethnic groups, public libraries, schools and institutions of higher learning,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Congress consider and approve legislation directed to library services which meet the needs of ethnic groups in America.

A National Library Service for the Deaf

WHEREAS, hearing impairment is the single most prevalent disability in the United States. It is a communication barrier that has led to misunderstanding and ignorance by the general public of the deaf person's needs. Deafness affects people of every age, race, ethnic origin, and educational background. It draws people together in a unique language which has its own context and meaning, serving as a native language to many, with English as a second language,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the States

1) train personnel on library service to the deaf;
2) establish a Library Commission for the Deaf which will include deaf individuals; and
3) establish a clearinghouse that will act as a sole Information and Referral in the State to assist *all* libraries to serve the deaf and the general public on information needs about deafness and services for the deaf—A storeplace for collection of special media for the deaf for interlibrary loan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Congress approve legislation to create a National Library Service for the Deaf, and that the Service shall be developed and devised by a board consisting of deaf professionals, deaf consumers, and library professionals.

Libraries for the Institutionalized

WHEREAS, individuals confined within institutions (correctional, mental hospitals, and facilities for the mentally retarded) are entitled to library and information services, and

WHEREAS, institutions, for the most part, provide little or inadequate library and information services,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Federal, State and local governments act to establish or enhance, libraries and information services for the institutionalized, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funds be appropriated at the Federal, State and local levels to support these services.

The People's Library Bill of Rights

BE IT RESOLVED, that the delegates to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services affirm their belief in the public right to library service as stated in the following tenets:

1) All people are entitled to free access to the information and knowledge within a library;
2) All people are entitled to obtain current, accurate information on any topic of interest;
3) All people are entitled to courteous, efficient, and prompt service;

4) All people are entitled to assistance by qualified library personnel;

5) All people are entitled to the right of privacy in the selection and use of materials;

6) All people are entitled to the full service of the library network on a local, regional, State, and national level;

7) All people are entitled to the use of a facility that is accessible, attractive, and comfortable;

8) All people are entitled to access to the policies regarding the use and services of a library; and

9) All people are entitled to library service that reflects the interests and needs of the total community.

Libraries as Recreational Resources

BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services hereby reaffirms the role of school and public libraries as not only an educational resource, but also a recreational resource committed to providing the public with a wide range of books, periodicals, and other kinds of traditional library resources.

Hispanic Office Within The National Library Agency

WHEREAS, efforts to serve the Spanish-speaking are diffused and uncoordinated, and

WHEREAS, information regarding these efforts is hard to obtain, and

WHEREAS, there exists a tremendous need to coordinate these efforts and disseminate information on them, and

WHEREAS, any significant improvements in the library services to the Spanish-speaking will require direct contact and attention from high governmental offices,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that an office, staffed with Spanish-speaking professional librarians, be instituted within the National Library Agency to address the library and information needs of the Spanish-speaking and that this office be authorized to act in the following capacity:

1) To coordinate national projects aimed at improving services to the Spanish-speaking.

2) To collect and disseminate information on local, State, and national projects.

3) To collect data for purposes of evaluating and reporting on the status of library and information services to the Spanish-speaking in the country.

4) To serve as a direct liason between the Spanish-speaking communities, the library profession, libraries serving the Spanish-speaking, and the Federal government.

Encouraging Library Usage

WHEREAS, the public libraries of the United States and its Territories are as integral a part of public education as the public schools; and

WHEREAS, the libraries of the United States and its Territories can serve both individual needs and democracy by promoting accurate and coherent information on social, cultural, political, and consumer issues, then

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that all delegates, alternates, observers, and other participants in the White House Conference on Library and Information Services make it their immediate goal that *no pupil* in their State or Territory shall finish this school year without coming to know and, as much as possible, to feel at home in, a neighborhood library; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that each participant in the Conference shall take it upon himself or herself to enlist the support of the State or Territory's parents, librarians, teachers, public administrations, private associations and businesses, and other appropriate instrumentalities to accomplish this definite goal.

Postal Reform Legislation

WHEREAS, libraries are dependent on the U.S. mails for receipt of materials from publishers and distributors, for interlibrary loans, and for direct library service to geographically isolated or homebound patrons, and

WHEREAS, current law PL 94-421 requires that the "educational, cultural, scientific, and informational value to the recipient of mail matter" be taken into consideration in setting postal rates, and

WHEREAS, the House of Representatives recently passed by an overwhelming margin a bill (HR 79) which would increase the public service subsidy to the U.S. Postal Service, extend the phased rate increases for fourth-class book and library rates over a longer period of time, and make further improvements to the library rate including extending it to books sent *from* libraries and educational institutions as well as *to* them,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that White House Conference on Library and Information Services delegates respectfully urge that the U.S. Senate pass legislation during the 96th Congress similar to HR 79, the Postal Service Act of 1979.

Telecommunications Rates

WHEREAS, in a democratic society an informed citizenry is basic to the national interest, and

WHEREAS, libraries collectively are a major disseminator of occupational, educational, and recreational information to the American people, and

WHEREAS, today's libraries are no longer just repositories for books but sources of information with emphasis on access and communication, and

WHEREAS, the enormous proliferation and fragmentation of knowledge, the increasing sophistication of information necessary to function in today's complex society, and the explosive development of information and communication technologies to meet these demands, all make use of telecommunications technologies by libraries essential, and

WHEREAS, ample precedent exists in public laws and regulatory policy for giving special recognition to nonprofit libraries and educational institutions as they carry out their responsibilities to the public,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that White House Conference on Library and Information Services delegates call upon Congress and the Administration to establish by statute the ability for common carriers to provide preferential rates for nonprofit libraries and educational institutions in their uses of telecommunications channels of all types for inter-institutional transmissions and for the distribution of information to the public.

Expansion of Office of Libraries

WHEREAS, American libraries have long served as an indispensable element in both formal and lifelong education, and the importance of libraries in the educational process has long been recognized by the Federal government, and

WHEREAS, libraries are a cross-cutting function providing support for all levels and forms of education, and have elements in common with other cross-cutting functions such as education technology, telecommunications demonstrations, education information centers, and literacy activities, and

WHEREAS, the newly-created cabinet-level Department of Education provides an opportunity for rethinking and restructuring cross-cutting functions such as libraries,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that White House Conference on Library and Information Services delegates support the expansion of the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, under the direction of an Assistant Secretary within the new Department of Education, and call upon Congress and the Administration to take favorable action in support of this resolution.

Funding Federal Library Programs

WHEREAS, an informed citizenry is essential in a democratic society, and

WHEREAS, the level of literacy necessary to function effectively in today's complex society is steadily rising, and

WHEREAS, it is a priority of both Congress and the Administration to improve the basic learning skills of elementary and secondary school students, and to reduce adult illiteracy, and

WHEREAS, basic skills and literacy cannot be improved without a commitment to library support, and

WHEREAS, reports of preliminary Federal budget figures for fiscal year 1981 indicate sharp reductions in library funding,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that White House Conference on Library and Information Services delegates call upon Congress and the Administration to restore and increase funds for Federal library programs to ensure effective library and information services for all citizens.

Support for Education for Library and Information

WHEREAS, effective provision of library and information services to meet the current and future needs of citizens will be largely dependent upon the availability of competent staff, and

WHEREAS, the complexities of the information society necessitates a continuing supply of well educated, quality persons as information professionals, and

WHEREAS, the rapidly expanding technologies, new techniques for information delivery, and new services to user populations demand library staffs who are continuously expanding their knowledge and abilities to meet new challenges through continuing education and personal development, and

WHEREAS, the new information society presents challenges which require systematic research efforts which might appropriately be addressed by Graduate Schools of Library and Information Science, and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government through Title II of the Higher Education Act and other Federal legislation has recognized its responsibility to support education and research for librarianship and information management,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that continued and intensified efforts be made by the Federal government to provide direct designated support to education in library and information sciences; this support be in forms which will encourage recruitment and instructional improvement, research and demonstration.

Funding for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

WHEREAS, school library media programs are dependent to a critical extent upon funding made available to them through Title IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended in 1978, and

WHEREAS, ESEA Title IV-B funds, due to inflation, ever growing needs for more diversified instructional materials and equipment within schools and increased use of these materials by teachers, students and the community, are barely adequate to supplement local and State support for school library media programs, and

WHEREAS, the need for effective school library media programs, staffed by certified library media professionals and support personnel and capable of providing a full range of instructional materials, equipment and services has been endorsed by numerous individuals and groups attending the White House Conference on Library and Information Services held in Washington, D.C., November 15-19, 1979,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the participants in the White House Conference on Library and Information Services communicate to the President and the Congress of the United States their support for the full funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title IV-B Program to at least the level of the FY 1979-80 budget ($171,000,000), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these funds be designated for the exclusive purchase of library materials (print and audiovisual materials) and equipment for use within the instructional program in America's public and non-public schools.

Elimination of Duplication of Services

WHEREAS, the purpose of this resolution is to:

1) Make the best use of the public's financial resources;
2) Provide a coordinated approach in the provision of information;
3) Eliminate duplicative information programs, and
4) Provide a central focus to which citizens can turn for information.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following actions should be taken:

1) The President should issue an executive order amending the A-95 clearinghouse review process to require that application for Federal grants be reviewed to reduce duplication of information services;
2) Incentives should be provided to encourage applicants for Federal and State funding programs to demonstrate that they will not duplicate an information program already serving the target groups;
3) Preference should be given to libraries as information service providers where such preference would not duplicate existing programs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Federal and State legislation and rules should be in keeping with the principles set forth in this resolution.

Local Community Control

WHEREAS, the mainstays of libraries have traditionally been found in local community support,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that there be included in the national information policy elements to ensure continued local control of community libraries and information services.

Personnel Selection

WHEREAS, in order to provide access to the full range of modern information services, libraries require appropriate qualified personnel, and

WHEREAS, library education and training programs need guidance to insure that curricula provide for the development of competencies actually required in libraries to serve citizens, and

WHEREAS, libraries need assistance in designing employee selection procedures and criteria to meet the requirements of law, to provide equal employment opportunities and to ensure that all personnel have the required knowledge, skills, and abilities,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services recommends that the Federal government fund a study to develop and validate personnel selection procedures to ensure that the most capable personnel are selected and that equal employment opportunity is provided to all.

Constitutional Amendment

WHEREAS, technological development is creating a fundamental change in society, a change from an industrial society to an information society, and

WHEREAS, constant change is experienced as a sense of frustration by people because they lack a sense of control, purpose and understanding, and

WHEREAS, information is not perceived as an available tool to solve the frustration, and

WHEREAS, libraries and information centers are existing social institutions that could fulfill the need for understanding and control, and

WHEREAS, to fulfill this need libraries and information centers have a constitutional basis to protect them from the exigencies of economic and political crises, and

WHEREAS, a Constitutional Amendment will establish primacy of the need for information in any non-constitutional conflict and an equal primacy with other rights in case of constitutional controversy, and

WHEREAS, the resolution of constitutional controversy by court and legislative action if the amendment is adopted, and the controversy raised during the process of adoption, will in both cases help increase awareness of the role of information and the changing nature of our society, and

WHEREAS, the purpose of a free society is the fullest possible development of the individuals of that society, that integral to their development is free access to any and all information within that society,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that it shall be the responsibility of the Federal government to provide the necessary funds to research and provide the most efficient means of making this information accessible to all the citizens of our society.

State Library Agency Planning

WHEREAS, effective provision of library and information services requires a strong partnership of Federal, State and local governments, and

WHEREAS, strong State library agencies are an essential component in that partnership for statewide planning, coordinating and developing library and information services in the State,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Federal legislation include a title for Library Planning and Development to provide matching funds for State library agency planning and evaluation, studies and research, coordination with all Federal library grant programs, planning for State network development and coordination with multi-state and/or national networks, continuing education and staff development, and administration of Federal grant funds.

Thursday, November 15, 1979

Activities	
Noon-7 p.m.	Registration
Noon-5 p.m.	White House Conference Information Center
Noon-5 p.m.	Films on Library and Information Services
2 p.m.-5:30 p.m.	Delegate Caucuses
5:30 p.m.-7:00 p.m.	Reception
7:00 p.m.-9:30 p.m.	Banquet

Formal Opening:

Chairman:
Charles Benton, Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and The White House Conference on Library and Information Services

Swearing In of Delegates:
U.S. Judge Abner J. Mikva

Greetings:
Marilyn Killebrew Gell, Executive Director of the White House Conference Staff

Marion Barry, Mayor of Washington, D.C.

Presentation of Awards:

Presented by:
Dr. Martin M. Cummings, Director, National Library of Medicine

Awards To:
Channing L. Bete, Sr. (Posthumous)

U.S. Representative John Brademas, *Indiana*

Carl A. Elliott, Former U.S. Representative from Alabama

U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson, *Washington*

Bessie Boehm Moore, Vice Chairman of The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Member of The Advisory Committee on The White House Conference on Library and Information Services

U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell, *Rhode Island*

U.S. Representative Carl D. Perkins, *Kentucky*

Thursday,
November 15, 1979

Activities

Remarks:

Richard M. Neustadt, Assistant Director, Domestic Policy Staff, The White House

U.S. Representative William D. Ford, *Michigan*

U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits, *New York*

9:45 p.m.-Close

General Session I

Adoption of Rules

Moderators:

U.S. Judge Abner J. Mikva

Edmund M. Reggie, Executive Counsel to the Governor of Louisiana

Friday,
November 16, 1979

Activities	
8 a.m.-6 p.m.	Registration
9 a.m.-5 p.m.	White House Conference Information Center
9:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.	General Session II Presidential Address: President Jimmy Carter Five Conference Themes Moderator: Frank Fitzmaurice, Producer, National Public Radio Speakers: Clara S. Jones, Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; *Library and Information Services for Personal Needs* Francis Keppel, Director, Aspen Institute For Humanistic Studies; *Library and Information Services for Lifelong Learning* Herbert D. Benington, Vice President, The MITRE Corporation; *Library and Information Services for Organizations and the Professions* Major R. Owens, New York State Senator; *Library and Information Services for Governing Our Society* Bernard Ostry, Deputy Minister Of Communications for Canada; *Library and Information Services for International Understanding and Cooperation*
11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Intermission
12:30 p.m.-2:15 p.m.	Luncheon "Telefuture" Videotape Segments Moderator: Robert Lee Chartrand, Senior Specialist in Information Policy and Technology, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress

Friday, November 16, 1979

Activities

	Speakers: Nicholas Johnson, Chairman, National Citizens Communications Lobby Robert B. Pfannkuch, President, Video Group, Bell & Howell Co.
2:15 p.m.-2:30 p.m.	Intermission
2:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.	Work Sessions
2:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.	Open Hearing I Presiding: Bessie Boehm Moore
6 p.m.-9 p.m.	Reception Sponsored by American Library Association and Library of Congress
6 p.m.-11 p.m.	Delegate Caucuses
9 p.m.-11 p.m.	Multi-media Programs: *The Library: A Place to Grow;* Audiovisual Center, The University of Iowa *Libraries in the Information Age;* Educational Systems and Learning Resources, University of Utah *The Future Is Today;* Colorado State Library *Ideas for the Library of the Future;* The School of Architecture, Mississippi State University

Saturday, November 17, 1979

Activities	
8 a.m.-7 p.m.	Registration
8:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.	Open Hearing II Presiding: Horace E. Tate, Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science
8:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.	Work Sessions
9 a.m.-5 p.m.	White House Conference Information Center
Noon-2 p.m.	Luncheon Presiding: Warren G. Hill, Member of the Advisory Committee on The White House Conference on Library and Information Services Speakers: Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas George Schrader, City Manager of Dallas, Texas
2:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.	Open Hearing III Presiding: William J. Welsh, The Deputy Librarian of Congress
2:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.	Work Sessions
6:30 p.m.-8 p.m.	Banquet Presiding: Philip A. Sprague, Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Speaker: James H. Boren, Founder and President, International Association of Bureaucrats
8 p.m.-10 p.m.	White House Conference Information Center
8:30 p.m.-11 p.m.	Theme Sessions
11 p.m.	Recommendations Committees

Conference Agenda

Sunday,
November 18, 1979

Activities	
7 a.m.-8 a.m.	Religious Services
8 a.m.-7 p.m.	Registration
Noon-5 p.m.	White House Conference Information Center
8:30 a.m.-Noon	Theme Sessions
Noon-2 p.m.	Luncheon Speaker: Ralph Nader
2:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.	General Session III Moderators: U.S. Judge Abner J. Mikva Edmund M. Reggie, Executive Counsel to the Governor of Louisiana
6 p.m.-9 p.m.	International Receptions

Monday, November 19, 1979

Activities	
8 a.m.-3 p.m.	Registration
8 a.m.-11 a.m.	General Session IV Moderators: U.S. Judge Abner J. Mikva Edmund M. Reggie, Executive Counsel to the Governor of Louisiana Concluding Statement: Charles Benton
11 a.m.-1 p.m.	Joint Congressional Hearing Co-chairmen: U.S. Representative William D. Ford, *Michigan* U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell, *Rhode Island*
1 p.m.-3 p.m.	Luncheon Speaker: Stuart E. Eizenstat, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy
3 p.m.	Adjournment

Introduction to Statistics

Three categories of statistical data are included on the following pages: sociodemographics on Conference delegates, national resolutions by type and number, and State resolutions by type and number.

Statistics on the delegates are provided by age, educational level, ethnic level, handicap, income level, language, occupation, population, and sex. These statistics have been further broken down by the two types of delegates, as required by public law, "lay"—citizens at large, and "library"—citizens within library or information science fields.

The 64 resolutions passed by delegates to the Conference were analyzed by content, to establish keywords. For each keyword, the number of resolutions dealing with that topic is given.

The resolutions passed at the 58 pre-Conference meetings have been analyzed in the same way as the national resolutions. In addition, statistics on resolutions by keyword are provided for pre-Conference meetings held by States, Territories, and American Indians.

White House Conference Delegates: Socio-Demographic Statistics

Age

DELEGATES BY AGE CATEGORY
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
UNDER 20	27	0	27
20-29	57	13	70
30-39	113	55	168
40-49	123	69	192
50-59	82	62	144
60+	37	20	57
N/A	4	6	10
TOTAL	443	225	668
UNDER 20	6.0	0.0	4.0
20-29	12.8	5.7	10.4
30-39	25.5	24.4	25.1
40-49	27.7	30.6	28.7
50-59	18.5	27.5	21.5
60+	8.3	8.8	8.5
N/A	0.9	2.6	1.4
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

Educational Level

DELEGATES BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
ELEMENTARY	17	0	17
HIGH SCHOOL	61	11	72
COLLEGE	151	21	172
ADV DEGREE	212	191	403
OTHER	1	0	1
N/A	1	2	3
TOTAL	443	225	668
ELEMENTARY	3.8	0.0	2.5
HIGH SCHOOL	13.7	4.8	10.7
COLLEGE	34.0	9.3	25.7
ADV DEGREE	47.8	84.8	60.3
OTHER	0.2	0.0	0.1
N/A	0.2	0.8	0.4
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

OTHER EDUCATIONAL CATEGORIES

4TH GRADE 1

Ethnic Group

DELEGATES BY ETHNIC GROUP
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
WHITE	300	175	475
BLACK	76	28	104
HISPANIC	21	6	27
ASIAN AM	12	3	15
NATIVE AM	14	4	18
OTHER	14	3	17
N/A	6	6	12
TOTAL	443	225	668
WHITE	67.7	77.7	71.1
BLACK	17.1	12.4	15.5
HISPANIC	4.7	2.6	4.0
ASIAN AM	2.7	1.3	2.2
NATIVE AM	3.1	1.7	2.6
OTHER	3.1	1.3	2.5
N/A	1.3	2.6	1.7
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

OTHER ETHNIC CATEGORIES

Caroinian-Pacific Islander	1
Chamorro	5
Franco-American	1
Hawaiian-Caucasian	1
Micronesian	4
Polynesian	1
Samoan	3
Yaqui-Mexican	1

Handicap

DELEGATES BY HANDICAP
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
BLIND	17	1	18
DEAF	2	3	5
MOTOR	9	2	11
OTHER	0	1	1
N/A	415	218	633
TOTAL	443	225	668
BLIND	3.8	0.4	2.6
DEAF	0.4	1.3	0.7
MOTOR	2.0	0.8	1.6
OTHER	0.0	0.4	0.1
N/A	93.6	96.8	94.7
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

OTHER HANDICAPS

Cardiac	1

Income Level

DELEGATES BY INCOME BRACKET
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
0-4999	33	6	39
5000-9999	41	9	50
10000-19999	130	58	188
20000-29999	110	67	177
30000+	104	73	177
N/A	25	12	37
TOTAL	443	225	668
0-4999	7.4	2.6	5.8
5000-9999	9.2	4.0	7.4
10000-19999	29.3	25.7	28.1
20000-29999	24.8	29.7	26.4
30000+	23.4	32.4	26.4
N/A	5.6	5.3	5.5
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

Language

DELEGATES BY LANGUAGE
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
ENGLISH	428	215	643
OTHER	13	6	19
N/A	2	4	6
TOTAL	443	225	668
ENGLISH	96.6	95.5	96.2
OTHER	2.9	2.6	2.8
N/A	0.4	1.7	0.8
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

OTHER LANGUAGE CATEGORIES

American Sign Language	2
Carolinian	1
Chamorro	4
French	2
Samoan	2
Spanish	8

Occupation

LAY DELEGATES BY OCCUPATION

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
AGRICULTURE	11	1.6
BUSINESS/INDUSTRY	42	6.2
EDUCATION	121	18.0
GOVERNMENT	49	7.3
HOMEMAKER	41	6.1
LABOR	5	0.7
PROFESSIONAL, OTHER	68	10.1
RETIRED	19	2.8
SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY	8	1.1
STUDENT	39	5.8
OTHER	37	5.5
N/A	230	34.3
TOTAL	670	100.0

LIBRARY RELATED DELEGATES BY OCCUPATION

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
ACADEMIC LIBRARY	36	5.3
ARCHIVES	6	0.8
EDUCATOR,LIB./INFO. SCIENCE	20	2.9
FEDERAL LIBRARY	3	0.4
INFORMATION SERVICE	2	0.2
MEDIA SPECIALIST	1	0.1
NETWORK CENTER	4	0.5
PUBLIC LIBRARY	63	9.4
RETIRED LIBRARIAN	1	0.1
SCHOOL/MEDIA CENTER	25	3.7
SPECIAL LIBRARY	14	2.0
STATE/TERRITORY LIB. AGENCY	19	2.8
OTHER	20	2.9
N/A	456	68.0
TOTAL	670	100.0

OTHER OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

Governors Asst. for Libraries	1
State Government Public Information	1
Unemployed for 32 yrs.	1

Population

DELEGATES BY POPULATION CATEGORY
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
0-25000	154	60	214
25000-100000	129	71	200
100000-1 MIL	111	73	184
1 MILLION+	45	18	63
N/A	4	3	7
TOTAL	443	225	668
0-25000	34.7	26.6	32.0
25000-100000	29.1	31.5	29.9
100000-1 MIL	25.0	32.4	27.5
1 MILLION+	10.1	8.0	9.4
N/A	0.9	1.3	1.0
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

Sex

DELEGATES BY SEX
(PERCENTAGES FIGURED BELOW)

	LAY	LIBRARY	TOTAL
MALE	233	90	323
FEMALE	197	129	326
N/A	13	6	19
TOTAL	443	225	668
MALE	52.5	40.0	48.3
FEMALE	44.4	57.3	48.8
N/A	2.9	2.6	2.8
TOTAL	66.3	33.6	100.0

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
1	ACADEMC LIBRARIES
5	ACADEMIC LIBRARIES
10	ACCESS
8	ACCESS BARRIERS
2	ACGUISITIONS
1	ADMINISTRATION
3	ADULTS
2	ADVISORY COUNCILS
1	AGED
3	ALA
1	ALASKAN NATIVES
1	AMERICAN INDIANS
1	APPRECIATION
1	ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS
2	ARCHIVES
2	ARTS
4	AUDIO VISUAL
2	AUDIO-VISUAL
2	AUTHORS
3	BLIND
1	BRAILLE
1	BROADCASTING
1	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
2	CAREER
1	CATALOGING
1	CENSORSHIP
1	CERTIFICATION
7	CHILDREN
6	CITIZEN PARTICIPATION
6	CLEARINGHOUSES
3	COLLECTIONS
1	COLLEGE
2	COMMUNICATION
4	COMMUNITY SERVICES
3	COMPUTERS
4	CONFERENCE
11	CONGRESS
1	CONSTRUCTION
4	CONSULTANTS
11	CONTINUING EDUCATION
1	COOOPERATION
1	COOOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES
1	COOPERATION
10	COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES
1	COOPERATON WITH OTHER AGENCIES
1	COPYRIGHT
2	CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS
4	CULTURAL PRESERVATION
3	DATA BASES
1	DEAF
8	DELIVERY
4	DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS
1	DEPOSITORIES
7	DEPT OF EDUCATION
1	DEPT OF THE INTERIOR
1	DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED
3	DOCUMENTS
4	DUPLICATION OF EFFORT
6	EDUCATION
1	EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDERN ACT OF 1975
7	EQUAL ACCESS
1	EQUIPMENT
1	ESEA
3	ETHNIC GROUPS
4	EVALUATION
4	FACILITIES
1	FCC
22	FEDERAL FUNDING
2	FEDERAL LIBRARIES

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
1	FEES
1	FILMS
3	FIRST AMENDMENT
1	FOUNDATIONS
2	FREE
2	FREEDOM TO READ
1	FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY
2	FUNDING FORMULAS
1	GIFTED
2	GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
1	GOVERNMENT INFO
2	GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
1	GOVERNOR
1	GPO
8	GRANTS
4	HANDICAPPED
1	HEA
1	HEW
1	HHPRC
1	HIGHER EDUCATION
2	HISTORICAL PRESERVATION
1	HOME-BOUND
1	HOURS
4	INFORMATION AND REFERRAL
1	INSTITUTE FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL COOPERATION
3	INSTITUTIONALIZED
2	INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM
1	INTERAGENCY COOPERATION
1	INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION
1	INTERLIBRARY LOAN
12	INTERNATIONAL
1	INTERNATIONAL YOUTH LIBRARY
5	LANGUAGES
1	LAW
1	LEARNING DISABLED
1	LEGISLATURE
3	LIBRARIANS
2	LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
2	LIBRARY BILL OF RIGHTS
3	LIBRARY BOARDS
4	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
7	LIBRARY SCHOOLS
3	LIBRARY SKILLS
6	LIFELONG LEARNING
3	LITERACY
2	LOBBYING
4	LOCAL AUTONOMY
3	LSCA
2	MANUSCRIPTS
1	MATCHING
2	MATERIALS
2	MENTALLY HANDICAPPED
2	MICROFORM
6	MINORITIES
2	MULTITYPE LIBRARIES
1	MUSEUMS
1	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
1	NATIONAL ARCHIVES
1	NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE
2	NATIONAL COORDINATING AGENCY
1	NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
1	NATIONAL INDIAN LIBRARY CENTER
1	NATIONAL INDIAN OMNIBUS BILL
9	NATIONAL INFORMATION POLICY
1	NATIONAL LIBRARY
2	NATIONAL LIBRARY ACT
1	NATIONAL LIBRARY AGENCY
1	NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
1	NATIONAL LOGO
2	NATIONAL NETWORK
1	NATIONAL PERIODICALS CENTER

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
3	NATIONAL SECURITY
1	NATL COORDINATING AGENCY
5	NCLIS
5	NEEDS ASSESSMENT
10	NETWORKING
1	NLSBPH
4	NON PROFIT
1	NON PROFIT LIBRARIES
1	NON USERS
1	OFFICE OF LIBRARIES AND LEARNING RESOURCES
1	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
3	OUTREACH
1	PER CAPITA FUNDING
5	PERSONNEL
1	PHOTOCOPYING
1	PLA
4	PLANNING
4	POLITICS
3	POSTAL SERVICE
1	POSTAL SERVICES
4	PRESERVATION
5	PRESIDENT
1	PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND INTERNATIONAL S
3	PRIVACY
5	PRIVATE LIBRARIES
7	PRIVATE SECTOR
3	PROFESSIONALS
2	PUBLIC AWARENESS
7	PUBLIC LIBRARIES
1	PUBLIC LIBRARY
1	PUBLIC LIBRARY MISSION STATEMENT
1	PUBLIC RELATIONS
1	PUBLISHERS
4	PUBLISHING
2	RECRUITMENT
1	REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973
9	RESEARCH
5	RESOURCE SHARING
1	RESOURCES
1	RIGHT TO READ
5	RURAL
1	SCHOOL BOARDS
7	SCHOOL LIBRARIES
3	SCHOOLS
2	SCIENCE
1	SELECTION
2	SENIOR CITIZENS
1	SIGN LANGUAGE
6	SPECIAL CONSTITUENCIES
3	SPECIAL LIBRARIES
9	STANDARDS
8	STATE FUNDING
5	STATE LIBRARY
2	STUDENTS
2	TAX
1	TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969
12	TECHNOLOGY
7	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
3	TRUSTEES
1	TTY
1	TUTORIAL PROGRAMS
3	U.S. TERRITORIES
1	UNESCO
1	UNITED NATIONS
1	UNIVERSAL AVAILABILITY OF PUBLICATIONS
1	UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION
2	URBAN
1	USERS
1	VIDEO
1	VOLUNTEERS
1	WOMEN
7	YOUTH

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
4	AAP
1	AASL
1	AAUP
65	ACADEMIC LIBRARIES
183	ACCESS
29	ACCESS BARRIERS
17	ACCREDITATION
55	ACQUISITIONS
39	ADMINISTRATION
34	ADULTS
17	ADVERTISING
51	ADVISORY COUNCILS
1	AECT
4	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
7	AGRICULTURE
58	ALA
3	ALASKAN NATIVES
1	AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSN
40	AMERICAN INDIANS
14	APPRECIATION
1	AQUACULTURE
25	ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS
33	ARCHIVES
18	ARTS
5	ASIAN
83	AUDIO VISUAL
4	AUTHORS
22	BILINGUAL
11	BLACKS
70	BLIND
42	BOARD OF EDUCATION
41	BORROWER'S CARD
5	BRAILLE
13	BRANCH LIBRARIES
13	BROADCASTING
63	BUDGET
25	BUILDINGS
1	BUREAU OF EDUCATION
1	BUREAU OF HEALTH EDUCATION
5	BUREAU OF LIBRARIES
30	BUSINESS
1	CANADIAN AGENCY
17	CAREER
1	CARTOON CHARACTER
31	CATALOGING
29	CENSORSHIP
2	CENSUS
47	CERTIFICATION
2	CETA
91	CHILDREN
10	CIRCULATION
132	CITIZEN PARTICIPATION
1	CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964
13	CLEARINGHOUSES
1	CLR
1	COCONUT
106	COLLECTIONS
27	COLLEGE
52	COMMUNICATION
11	COMMUNITY COLLEGE
140	COMMUNITY SERVICES
1	COMPUTER
79	COMPUTERS
54	CONFERENCE
32	CONFERENCE FOLLOW UP
86	CONGRESS
107	CONSTRUCTION
32	CONSULTANTS

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
12	CONSUMERS
233	CONTINUING EDUCATION
62	COOPERATION
4	COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES
32	COORDINATING AGENCY
21	COPYRIGHT
49	CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS
42	COUNTY
6	COURTS
53	CULTURAL PRESERVATION
41	DATA BASES
41	DEAF
44	DELIVERY
12	DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS
4	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1	DEPARTMENT OF ELDERLY AFFAIRS
2	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
1	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARY AND INFO. SERVICES
1	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
21	DEPOSITORIES
2	DEPT OF COMMERCE
2	DEPT OF CORRECTIONS
85	DEPT OF EDUCATION
1	DEPT OF FINANCE
1	DEPT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
3	DEPT OF INTERIOR
1	DEPT OF LAW
1	DEPT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION
3	DEPT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
3	DEPT OF THE INTERIOR
7	DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED
15	DISADVANTAGED
37	DISTRIBUTION
8	DOCUMENTS
1	DPULICATION OF EFFORT
3	DRUG ABUSE
21	DUPLICATION OF EFFORT
144	EDUCATION
2	EDUCATION MEDIA ASSOCIATION
6	ENDOWMENTS
6	ENERGY
3	ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
85	EQUAL ACCESS
2	EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT
2	EQUALIZATION FUNDING
1	EQUALIZATON FUNDING
33	EQUIPMENT
17	ESEA
1	ETHNIC GROUP
49	ETHNIC GROUPS
89	EVALUATION
5	EXHIBITS
116	FACILITIES
10	FACULTY
1	FCC
1	FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS
284	FEDERAL FUNDING
14	FEDERAL LIBRARIES
1	FEDERAL LIBRARY COMMITTEE
1	FEDERAL REHABILITATION ACT
23	FEES
21	FILMS
9	FINES
8	FIRST AMENDMENT
1	FLORENCE AGREEMENT
9	FOUNDATIONS
61	FREE
2	FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
2	FREEDOM TO READ

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
43	FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY
527	FUNDING
12	FUNDING FORMULAS
10	FUNDS DISTRIBUTION
2	GENEOLOGY
9	GIFTED
17	GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
19	GOVERNOR
9	GOVERNORS CONFERENCE
3	GPO
68	GRANTS
1	GRASS-ROOTS
2	GRASSROOTS
177	HANDICAPPED
14	HEA
30	HEALTH
10	HEW
8	HIGH INTEREST LOW VOCAB
40	HIGHER EDUCATION
16	HISPANIC
36	HISTORICAL PRESERVATION
25	HOMEBOUND
2	HOMOSEXUALS
69	HOURS
1	ICE CREAM
1	IFLA
4	IMMIGRANTS
11	INDUSTRY
35	INFORMATION AND REFERRAL
19	INFORMATION SERVICES
78	INSTITUTIONALIZED
11	INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM
110	INTER AGENCY COOPERATION
1	INTERAGENCY COOPERATION
64	INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION
53	INTERLIBRARY LOAN
16	INTERNATIONAL
1	INTERNATIONAL LOGO
5	INTERPRETERS
1	JOHN CRERAR LIBRARY
1	LABOR
1	LANGUAGE
50	LANGUAGES
9	LARGE PRINT
40	LAW
2	LEAGUE OF CITIES
11	LEARNING DISABLED
156	LEGISLATION
173	LEGISLATURE
2	LIBRARIAN
37	LIBRARIANS
96	LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
18	LIBRARY BILL OF RIGHTS
59	LIBRARY BOARDS
44	LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT
45	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
101	LIBRARY SCHOOLS
66	LIBRARY SKILLS
1	LIFE LONG LEARNING
4	LIFELONG LEARNING
59	LITERACY
1	LITERACY VOLUNTEERS OF AMER
36	LOBBYING
1	LOCAL
15	LOCAL AUTONOMY
1	LOCAL FUNDING
64	LOCAL LIBRARIES
57	LSCA
10	MAIL SERVICE

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
1	MANAGEMENT
9	MANUSCRIPTS
4	MARC
8	MARKETING
20	MATCHING FUNDS
1	MATCHING GRANTS
1	MATERIALS
94	MEDIA
1	MEDICAL LIBRARY NETWORK
17	MEDICINE
15	MENTAL HEALTH
26	MENTALLY HANDICAPPED
16	MICROFORM
45	MINORITIES
161	MULTI TYPE LIBRARIES
1	MULTI-STATE NETWORKS
1	MULTI-TYPE LIBRARIES
7	MUSEUMS
1	NAT CITIZENS EMERGENCY COMMITTEE TO SAVE OUR PUBLIC LIBRARIES
1	NATIONAL ADVERTISING COUNCIL
1	NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN
1	NATIONAL CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE
1	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND
1	NATIONAL INDIAN OMNIBUS LIBRARY BILL
13	NATIONAL LIBRARIES
1	NATIONAL LIBRARIES YEAR
3	NATIONAL LIBRARY ACT
10	NATIONAL LIBRARY AGENCY
1	NATIONAL LIBRARY OF AGRICULTURE
9	NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
2	NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK
9	NATIONAL LOGO
88	NATIONAL NETWORK
9	NATIONAL PERIODICALS CENTER
1	NATIONAL POLICY
3	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
46	NCLIS
114	NEEDS ASSESSMENT
1	NEEDS AWARENESS
1	NELINET
5	NETWORK
247	NETWORKING
2	NEW YORK TIMES DATA BASE
1	NEWBERRY LIBRARY
5	NEWSPAPERS
3	NHPRC
8	NLSBPH
7	NON PROFIT
36	NON USERS
1	NTIS
57	OUTREACH
23	PARAPROFESSIONAL
1	PARAPROFESSIONALS
22	PARENTS
14	PER CAPITA FUNDING
323	PERSONNEL
7	PHOTOCOPYING
27	PHYSICAL ACCESS
83	PLANNING
1	PNBC
35	POLICY
19	POLITICS
29	POSTAL SERVICE
1	PRATT-SMOOT ACT
55	PRESERVATION
13	PRESIDENT
15	PRIVACY
13	PRIVATE LIBRARIES

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
57	PRIVATE SECTOR
24	PROFESSIONALS
3	PROPOSITION 13
74	PUBLIC AWARENESS
358	PUBLIC LIBRARIES
12	PUBLIC OPINION
209	PUBLIC RELATIONS
1	PUBLIC SERVICE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS ACT
2	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
35	PUBLISHING
15	RADIO
35	READING
2	READING IS FUNDAMENTAL
10	RECORDED MATERIALS
19	RECREATION
10	RECRUITMENT
18	REFERENCE
1	REFERENCE SERVICES
83	REGIONAL
12	REHABILITATION
7	RELIGION
77	RESEARCH
26	RESOURCE SHARING
161	RESOURCES
7	REVENUE SHARING
10	RIGHT TO READ
49	RURAL
1	SAA
18	SALARY
10	SCHOLARSHIPS
11	SCHOOL BOARDS
266	SCHOOL LIBRARIES
102	SCHOOLS
5	SCIENCE
12	SECURITY
32	SELECTION
19	SENIOR CITIZENS
3	SEX
7	SIGN LANGUAGE
2	SLA
3	SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
10	SOLINET
1	SPACE POLICY ACT OF 1978
7	SPEAKERS
13	SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
63	SPECIAL CONSTITUENCIES
35	SPECIAL LIBRARIES
161	STANDARDS
1	STATE
22	STATE AGENCIES
1	STATE AID
3	STATE CONSTITUTION
310	STATE FUNDING
300	STATE LIBRARY
9	STATISTICS
63	STUDENTS
3	SUPREME COURT
16	TASK FORCE
88	TAX
1	TAX INCENTIVE
31	TEACHERS
130	TECHNOLOGY
39	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
1	TELEPHONE SERVICE
25	TELEPHONE SERVICES
37	TELEVISION
1	TOLL FREE TELEPHONE
2	TOYS
15	TRANSPORTATION

TOTAL NUMBER	SUBJECTS
62	TRUSTEES
5	TTY
1	TUTORIAL PROGAMS
6	TUTORIAL PROGRAMS
1	UNION LIST
28	UNION LISTS
32	UNIVERSITY
19	URBAN
1	USER
159	USERS
1	USOE
16	VIDEO
8	VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS
84	VOLUNTEERS
2	WELFARE
4	WOMEN
18	WORKSHOPS
61	YOUTH

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(American Indians through Missouri)

	AI	AK	AL	AR	AS	AZ	CA	CM	CO	CT	DC	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID	IL	IN	KS	KY	LA	MA	MD	ME	MI	MN	MO
AAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
ACADEMIC LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	0	8	0	1	2	0
ACCESS	1	5	1	0	8	1	0	1	3	9	0	0	15	18	6	2	1	0	3	3	1	0	17	4	8	3	1	0	1
ACCESS BARRIERS	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
ACCREDITATION	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
ACQUISITIONS	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	4	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0
ADMINISTRATION	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0
ADULTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	0
ADVERTISING	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
ADVISORY COUNCILS	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	3
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
AGRICULTURE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALA	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	0	7	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	2	3	0	5	0	0	1	1
ALASKAN NATIVES	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
AMERICAN INDIANS	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0
APPRECIATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1
AQUACULTURE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
ARCHIVES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
ARTS	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
ASIAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AUDIO VISUAL	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	3	4	4	2	2	1	4	1	4	2	2	1	2	0	0	2
AUTHORS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BILINGUAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
BLACKS	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BLIND	0	1	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	1	9	0	0	2	1	5	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	1
BOARD OF EDUCATION	0	2	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0
BORROWERS CARD	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	1	0
BRAILLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
BRANCH LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BROADCASTING	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BUDGET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	2	2	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0

CODES

AI	American Indians	GA	Georgia	MA	Massachusetts	NC	North Carolina	TT	Trust Territories
AL	Alabama	GU	Guam	MI	Michigan	ND	North Dakota	TX	Texas
AK	Alaska	HI	Hawaii	MN	Minnesota	NI	Northern Mariana Islands	UT	Utah
AZ	Arizona	ID	Idaho	MS	Mississippi	OH	Ohio	VT	Vermont
AR	Arkansas	IL	Illinois	MO	Missouri	OK	Oklahoma	VA	Virginia
AS	American Samoa	IN	Indiana	MT	Montana	OR	Oregon	VI	Virgin Islands
CA	California	IA	Iowa	NE	Nebraska	PA	Pennsylvania	WA	Washington
CO	Colorado	KS	Kansas	NV	Nevada	PR	Puerto Rico*	WV	West Virginia
CT	Connecticut	KY	Kentucky	NH	New Hampshire	RI	Rhode Island	WI	Wisconsin
DE	Delaware	LA	Louisiana	NJ	New Jersey	SC	South Carolina	WY	Wyoming
DC	District of Columbia	ME	Maine	NM	New Mexico	SD	South Dakota**		
FL	Florida	MD	Maryland	NY	New York	TN	Tennessee		

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(Mississippi through Wyoming)

	AI	AK	AL	AR	AS	AZ	CA	CM	CO	CT	DC	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID	IL	IN	KS	KY	LA	MA	MD	ME	MI	MN	MO
BUILDINGS	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
BUREAU OF HEALTH EDUCATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BUSINESS	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
CAREER	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
CARTOON CHARACTER	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CATALOGING	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CENSORSHIP	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
CENSUS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CERTIFICATION	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
CETA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHILDREN	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	3	1	10	2	5	3	3	0	6	2	1	1	1	1	1	0
CIRCULATION	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION	0	1	0	2	0	7	16	0	1	6	2	2	1	14	0	0	0	7	7	1	1	3	2	4	3	1	3	1	0
CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
CLEARINGHOUSES	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
CLR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
COLLECTIONS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	4	7	3	0	6	0	2	3	0	0	1	1	17	0	1	1	0
COLLEGE	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
COMMUNICATION	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	5	2	0	1	0	3	3	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0
COMMUNITY COLLEGE	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
COMMUNITY SERVICES	0	6	0	2	1	7	2	0	2	4	1	5	0	9	3	9	4	1	4	3	1	2	3	3	9	3	1	0	1
COMPUTER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COMPUTERS	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	12	2	1	1	2	4	2	0	2	4	0	3	1	2	1	0
CONFERENCE	0	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	6	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	8	1	0	1	0	0	1
CONFERENCE FOLLOW UP	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
CONGRESS	1	3	1	4	0	0	4	0	0	1	4	0	1	1	0	2	3	4	1	0	1	0	3	0	5	0	1	1	0
CONSTRUCTION	1	8	2	3	2	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	11	0	0	4	2	1	4	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	0
CONSULTANTS	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	9	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
CONSUMERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
CONTINUING EDUCATION	1	3	1	1	2	5	7	0	1	4	1	0	10	39	1	5	5	11	13	1	2	9	2	1	4	4	3	4	2
COOPERATION	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	0	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	1	11	2	0
COORDINATING AGENCY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
COPYRIGHT	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	14	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	2	0
COUNTY	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	1
COURTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
CULTURAL PRESERVATION	1	1	0	1	1	0	4	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
DATA BASES	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	0
DEAF	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	0	4	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	1	0	0
DELIVERY	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	1	0	4	0	0	0	0
DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARY AND INFO. SERVICES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPOSITORIES	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
DEPT OF COMMERCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF CORRECTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF EDUCATION	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	1	1	3	0	0	11	6	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	0
DEPT OF HUMAN RESOURCES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF INTERIOR	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF THE INTERIOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(American Indians through Missouri)

	AI	AK	AL	AR	AS	AZ	CA	CM	CO	CT	DC	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID	IL	IN	KS	KY	LA	MA	MD	ME	MI	MN	MO
DISADVANTAGED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	0
DISTRIBUTION	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
DOCUMENTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DPULICATION OF EFFORT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DRUG ABUSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
DUPLICATION OF EFFORT	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
EDUCATION	1	4	0	3	3	3	2	3	2	5	2	1	2	14	0	2	4	4	8	0	2	3	2	2	6	2	0	1	3
EDUCATION MEDIA ASSOCIATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENDOWMENTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENERGY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUAL ACCESS	0	6	0	3	0	4	0	0	4	8	2	0	0	3	0	0	6	0	1	1	2	1	0	5	2	4	1	0	0
EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUALIZATION FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUIPMENT	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
ESEA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0
ETHNIC GROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ETHNIC GROUPS	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	1	2	0
EVALUATION	0	2	3	2	2	2	3	0	0	4	0	4	4	6	1	0	1	3	3	1	0	1	3	1	3	1	2	3	1
EXHIBITS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FACILITIES	0	2	2	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	13	2	1	3	0	3	4	0	0	2	2	3	3	1	0	1
FACULTY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDING	0	2	2	0	3	7	19	0	1	6	2	1	4	50	4	6	7	11	8	2	5	3	1	5	12	1	6	7	1
FEDERAL LIBRARIES	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
FEDERAL LIBRARY COMMITTEE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEES	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
FILMS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
FINES	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
FIRST AMENDMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FOUNDATIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
FREE	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	3	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	5	2	1	1	0
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
FUNDING	4	11	2	12	6	13	5	1	3	7	8	1	10	117	10	2	14	0	6	8	10	6	12	11	17	7	8	2	4
FUNDING FORMULAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
FUNDS DISTRIBUTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GENEOLOGY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GIFTED	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GOVERNOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
GOVERNORS CONFERENCE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
GPO	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRANTS	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	16	0	0	0	4	2	0	4	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	0
GRASS-ROOTS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRASSROOTS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HANDICAPPED	0	1	1	4	0	1	4	1	3	7	1	2	3	15	5	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	7	0	13	1	5	4	4
HEA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
HEALTH	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
HEW	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
HIGH INTEREST LOW VOCAB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
HIGHER EDUCATION	1	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	1	0	2
HISPANIC	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
HISTORICAL PRESERVATION	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	0
HOMEBOUND	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(American Indians through Missouri)

	AI	AK	AL	AR	AS	AZ	CA	CM	CO	CT	DC	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID	IL	IN	KS	KY	LA	MA	MD	ME	MI	MN	MO
HOMOSEXUALS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
HOURS	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	6	1	1	0	5	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	1	1	0
IFLA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IMMIGRANTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
INDUSTRY	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
INFORMATION AND REFERRAL	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
INFORMATION SERVICES	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
INSTITUTIONALIZED	0	1	1	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	21	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	8	0	0	0	0
INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
INTER AGENCY COOPERATION	1	1	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	6	5	0	4	9	0	3	2	3	12	2	0	4	4	1	8	2	1	0	1
INTERAGENCY COOPERATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	1	1	2	3	0	1	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	2
INTERLIBRARY LOAN	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
INTERNATIONAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0
INTERNATIONAL LOGO	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
INTERPRETERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
JOHN CRERAR LIBRARY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LANGUAGES	2	1	0	0	3	0	4	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	2	1	2	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0
LARGE PRINT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAW	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	1
LEAGUE OF CITIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEARNING DISABLED	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEGISLATION	1	2	1	2	0	3	1	1	1	0	2	0	3	36	3	1	5	4	3	3	0	1	5	1	6	1	0	1	0
LEGISLATURE	0	2	0	3	0	0	7	1	0	2	1	0	6	12	9	0	5	1	1	1	7	1	4	0	3	1	2	7	1
LIBRARIAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIBRARIANS	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIBRARY ASSOCIATION	1	2	0	0	0	2	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	0
LIBRARY BILL OF RIGHTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0
LIBRARY BOARDS	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	5	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	1	0	0	1
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	0	4	0	0
LIBRARY SCHOOLS	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	1	1	3	0	2	16	2	1	1	2	3	0	0	5	2	3	4	2	0	2	0
LIBRARY SKILLS	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	1	1	2	0	1	2	4	1	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
LIFE LONG LEARNING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIFELONG LEARNING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
LITERACY	0	1	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	6	6	1	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	2
LITERACY VOLUNTEERS OF AMER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOBBYING	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
LOCAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOCAL AUTONOMY	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
LOCAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOCAL LIBRARIES	0	4	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	3	0	0	3	2	0	4	0	0	1	1
LSCA	0	1	0	2	1	2	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	6	0	1	3	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	3	1	0
MAIL SERVICE	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
MANAGEMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUSCRIPTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARKETING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
MATCHING FUNDS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MATERIALS	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDICINE	2	2	0	3	0	2	5	0	1	2	2	0	2	5	1	2	2	6	2	0	1	0	5	1	2	1	1	3	1
MENTAL HEALTH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
MENTALLY HANDICAPPED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(American Indians through Missouri)

	AI	AK	AL	AR	AS	AZ	CA	CM	CO	CT	DC	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID	IL	IN	KS	KY	LA	MA	MD	ME	MI	MN	MO
MICROFORM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
MINORITIES	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0
MULTI TYPE LIBRARIES	0	0	1	4	0	3	6	0	2	4	2	1	4	18	1	0	6	4	5	5	8	1	3	3	6	2	0	4	1
MULTI-STATE NETWORKS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MULTI-TYPE LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MUSEUMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
NAT CITIZENS EMERGENCY COMMITTEE TO SAVE OUR PUBLIC LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL ADVERTISING COUNCIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARIES	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY ACT	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY AGENCY	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF AGRICULTURE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LOGO	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL NETWORK	1	3	0	1	2	3	11	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	0	2	3	10	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	0	2	0
NATIONAL PERIODICALS CENTER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
NATIONAL POLICY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NCLIS	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	2	2	0
NEEDS ASSESSMENT	0	5	0	2	2	2	5	1	1	3	0	2	2	14	0	3	2	3	6	0	0	4	6	2	3	1	2	2	0
NEEDS AWARENESS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NETWORK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NETWORKING	2	7	1	2	0	5	6	0	3	2	3	3	12	41	9	5	9	5	2	3	3	5	6	5	13	1	3	5	4
NEW YORK TIMES DATA BASE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEWBERRY LIBRARY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEWSPAPERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NLSBPH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NON PROFIT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NON USERS	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	0
NTIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
OUTREACH	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	2	4	1	0	2	4	0	0	1	1	2	1
PARAPROFESSIONAL	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
PARAPROFESSIONALS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
PARENTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
PER CAPITA FUNDING	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
PERSONNEL	0	2	4	12	7	6	9	0	3	5	6	3	8	33	7	4	7	4	13	8	4	8	11	3	6	1	6	4	1
PHOTOCOPYING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
PHYSICAL ACCESS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0
PLANNING	1	1	0	5	0	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	0	11	0	0	1	0
POLICY	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	6	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
POLITICS	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
POSTAL SERVICE	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
PRATT-SMOOT ACT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PRESERVATION	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	6	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	3	0	0
PRESIDENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PRIVACY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	1	0	0	0
PRIVATE LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PRIVATE SECTOR	0	1	1	0	0	1	8	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	4	3	1	0	2	2	1	4	0	1	0	1
PROFESSIONALS	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
PROPOSITION 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PUBLIC AWARENESS	0	3	0	1	1	1	7	0	2	2	2	0	2	5	0	1	0	3	2	1	0	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(American Indians through Missouri)

	AI	AK	AL	AR	AS	AZ	CA	CM	CO	CT	DC	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID	IL	IN	KS	KY	LA	MA	MD	ME	MI	MN	MO
PUBLIC LIBRARIES	0	3	0	7	0	2	6	1	5	13	2	4	0	36	17	4	14	7	8	5	2	0	7	2	33	3	8	4	6
PUBLIC OPINION	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
PUBLIC RELATIONS	0	1	1	0	0	4	7	0	0	4	3	1	2	20	1	2	1	24	9	2	2	4	14	1	4	5	1	4	3
PUBLIC SERVICE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS ACT	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PUBLISHING	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	1
RADIO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
READING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	0
READING IS FUNDAMENTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RECORDED MATERIALS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RECREATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
RECRUITMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
REFERENCE	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
REGIONAL	0	3	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	8	1	0	4	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	4	1	2	2
REHABILITATION	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RELIGION	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
RESEARCH	0	2	0	1	0	0	5	0	1	1	1	0	0	5	5	0	1	0	7	2	0	1	0	1	7	1	2	4	1
RESOURCE SHARING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
RESOURCES	2	6	1	2	2	3	0	0	4	4	3	3	6	7	5	0	12	0	2	6	1	0	2	2	13	5	3	0	0
REVENUE SHARING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RIGHT TO READ	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
RURAL	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	1	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
SAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SALARY	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1
SCHOLARSHIPS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL BOARDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL LIBRARIES	0	2	1	4	1	6	3	0	1	2	2	0	9	32	7	4	7	11	5	7	1	5	9	4	9	3	4	4	3
SCHOOLS	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	3	1	4	2	2	1	12	3	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	1	1
SCIENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SECURITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
SELECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0
SENIOR CITIZENS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
SIGN LANGUAGE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
SOLINET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPACE POLICY ACT OF 1978	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPEAKERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
SPECIAL CONSTITUENCIES	0	3	0	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	5	5	0	3	0	5	2	0	0	4	1	0	2	0	2	0	0
SPECIAL LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	7	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
STANDARDS	1	3	4	5	0	3	5	0	0	2	1	1	5	14	0	3	1	6	6	0	1	6	3	2	1	0	2	4	2
STATE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STATE AGENCIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
STATE CONSTITUTION	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
STATE FUNDING	0	8	1	5	4	13	15	0	1	4	0	2	5	37	0	2	10	14	6	4	3	4	7	3	9	1	6	8	4
STATE LIBRARY	0	5	0	2	9	6	4	0	4	8	0	2	4	6	0	0	9	13	8	4	4	0	12	0	5	7	7	0	8
STATISTICS	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
STUDENTS	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	1	2	3	0	2	11	4	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0
SUPREME COURT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TASK FORCE	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
TAX	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	1	2	0	1	2	0	6	0	0	7	6	3	1	4	0	5	2	1	1	0	1	2
TEACHERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
TECHNOLOGY	0	1	1	3	0	0	6	0	1	3	6	1	3	7	1	5	0	3	9	3	0	1	1	3	7	2	3	0	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(American Indians through Missouri)

	AI	AK	AL	AR	AS	AZ	CA	CM	CO	CT	DC	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID	IL	IN	KS	KY	LA	MA	MD	ME	MI	MN	MO
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	0	2	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
TELEPHONE SERVICE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
TELEPHONE SERVICES	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
TELEVISION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
TOYS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRANSPORTATION	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
TRUSTEES	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	4	1	0	1	6	0	1	1
TTY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
TUTORIAL PROGAMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TUTORIAL PROGRAMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
UNION LISTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
UNIVERSITY	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
URBAN	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
USER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USERS	0	5	2	1	3	3	1	0	3	2	1	2	2	27	7	0	2	0	2	4	4	4	3	1	14	6	0	2	0
USOE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VIDEO	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VOLUNTEERS	0	0	1	0	0	1	10	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	4	1	4	4	1	2	3	9	0	2	2	1	0	0
WOMEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
WORKSHOPS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0
YOUTH	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	2	0	1	6	3	9	3	1	4	1	0	1	2	0	3	0	1	0	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(Mississippi through Wyoming)

	MS	MT	NC	ND	NE	NH	NJ	NM	NV	NY	OH	OK	OR	PA	PR	RI	SC	TN	TT	TX	UT	VA	VI	VT	WA	WI	WV	WY
AAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
AASL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
AAUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ACADEMIC LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	13	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
ACCESS	1	5	2	1	1	6	0	3	0	4	0	1	0	1	13	7	0	0	6	4	0	8	2	2	0	3	1	0
ACCESS BARRIERS	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	1
ACCREDITATION	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ACQUISITIONS	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	0
ADMINISTRATION	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
ADULTS	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	1	0
ADVERTISING	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
ADVISORY COUNCILS	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0
AECT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
AGRICULTURE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALA	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	6	0	0
ALASKAN NATIVES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
AMERICAN INDIANS	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	1
APPRECIATION	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1
ARCHIVES	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	0
ARTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
ASIAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
AUDIO VISUAL	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	0	1	1	0	2	9	0	1	2	1	8
AUTHORS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BILINGUAL	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0
BLACKS	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
BLIND	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	5	2	0	0	2	0	2	4	1	1	0	1	0
BOARD OF EDUCATION	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	1	0	3	0
BORROWERS CARD	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
BRAILLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
BRANCH LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
BROADCASTING	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
BUDGET	1	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	9	4	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	0	1	2	0
BUILDINGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
BUREAU OF EDUCATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BUREAU OF LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
BUSINESS	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	1
CANADIAN AGENCY	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAREER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
CATALOGING	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3	1	0	0
CENSORSHIP	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	0
CENSUS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
CERTIFICATION	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	1
CETA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHILDREN	2	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	3	2	2	2	1	0	3	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	1	4	2	0	3
CIRCULATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION	3	2	2	1	4	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	2	0	7	1	1	2	0	4	1
CLEARINGHOUSES	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COCONUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COLLECTIONS	4	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	15	1	0	1	3	0
COLLEGE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
COMMUNICATION	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	1	0
COMMUNITY COLLEGE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(Mississippi through Wyoming)

	MS	MT	NC	ND	NE	NH	NJ	NM	NV	NY	OH	OK	OR	PA	PR	RI	SC	TN	TT	TX	UT	VA	VI	VT	WA	WI	WV	WY
COMMUNITY SERVICES	2	8	1	4	1	3	0	1	0	0	2	3	1	0	8	2	3	0	1	3	0	3	1	0	3	0	2	2
COMPUTERS	0	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	2	2	0	2
CONFERENCE	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	5	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
CONFERENCE FOLLOW UP	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
CONGRESS	4	4	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	3	0	5	2	2	0	1
CONSTRUCTION	2	0	3	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	3	6	3	1	2	0	2	3	0	3	4	0	2	1	1	4
CONSULTANTS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
CONSUMERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
CONTINUING EDUCATION	2	3	3	2	6	2	3	0	5	1	1	4	3	0	7	4	8	1	2	3	0	8	4	2	7	3	0	4
COOPERATION	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
COORDINATING AGENCY	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
COPYRIGHT	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	1
COUNTY	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11
COURTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CULTURAL PRESERVATION	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	0	0	0
DATA BASES	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
DEAF	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
DELIVERY	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0
DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF ELDERLY AFFAIRS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
DEPOSITORIES	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF CORRECTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF EDUCATION	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	0	3	0	1	2	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	1	0	1	1
DEPT OF FINANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF LAW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEPT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
DISADVANTAGED	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
DISTRIBUTION	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	0
DOCUMENTS	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
DUPLICATION OF EFFORT	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
EDUCATION	5	11	2	3	0	2	3	0	0	2	0	6	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	0	4	2	0	1	1	2	3
EDUCATION MEDIA ASSOCIATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENDOWMENTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
ENERGY	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUAL ACCESS	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	0	0	2	2	1
EQUALIZATON FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUIPMENT	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0
ESEA	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
ETHNIC GROUPS	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	1	1
EVALUATION	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	3	3
EXHIBITS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FACILITIES	2	1	1	4	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	2	13	6	0	0	1	5	0	2	8	2	0	0	2	0
FACULTY	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDING	1	5	4	2	2	6	9	11	6	2	1	1	0	3	1	7	7	0	2	4	0	1	10	5	3	11	0	4
FEDERAL LIBRARIES	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
FEDERAL REHABILITATION ACT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEES	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(Mississippi through Wyoming)

	MS	MT	NC	ND	NE	NH	NJ	NM	NV	NY	OH	OK	OR	PA	PR	RI	SC	TN	TT	TX	UT	VA	VI	VT	WA	WI	WV	WY
FILMS	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1
FINES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
FIRST AMENDMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
FLORENCE AGREEMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
FOUNDATIONS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
FREE	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	1
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FREEDOM TO READ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY	1	2	2	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	2
FUNDING	6	12	4	2	6	4	1	2	3	11	1	10	8	10	23	14	5	3	5	18	3	10	19	2	1	2	8	10
FUNDING FORMULAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
FUNDS DISTRIBUTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
GIFTED	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
GOVERNOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	1	0	0
GRANTS	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	1
HANDICAPPED	2	5	1	0	2	1	0	4	2	5	1	2	1	3	9	6	3	1	1	4	0	6	12	1	3	2	2	1
HEA	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
HEALTH	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
HEW	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH INTEREST LOW VOCAB	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
HIGHER EDUCATION	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
HISPANIC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
HISTORICAL PRESERVATION	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	1	0	2	0	0	2
HOMEBOUND	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
HOURS	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	7	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	3	0	2	1
ICE CREAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
IMMIGRANTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
INDUSTRY	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
INFORMATION AND REFERRAL	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0
INFORMATION SERVICES	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
INSTITUTIONALIZED	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	2	0	0
INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
INTER AGENCY COOPERATION	0	3	1	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	0
INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	4	1	0	5	1	1
INTERLIBRARY LOAN	1	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	2	7	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1
INTERNATIONAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
INTERPRETERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LABOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LANGUAGE	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LANGUAGES	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	0
LARGE PRINT	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LAW	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEAGUE OF CITIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEARNING DISABLED	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEGISLATION	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	0	1	4	10	4	0	1	1	5	0	4	5	2	2	7	2	1
LEGISLATURE	4	10	0	0	2	3	2	2	11	4	0	5	4	4	1	0	8	0	1	7	0	1	3	6	9	4	3	2
LIBRARIAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIBRARIANS	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	0
LIBRARY ASSOCIATION	0	5	1	3	0	1	0	0	6	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	14	4	1	2	1	3	1	2	0	3	0	6
LIBRARY BILL OF RIGHTS	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
LIBRARY BOARDS	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	8	2	1	2	3
LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	2	0	1	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(Mississippi through Wyoming)

	MS	MT	NC	ND	NE	NH	NJ	NM	NV	NY	OH	OK	OR	PA	PR	RI	SC	TN	TT	TX	UT	VA	VI	VT	WA	WI	WV	WY
LIBRARY SCHOOLS	3	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	6	5	2	0	2	0	2	4	0	2	2	0	1
LIBRARY SKILLS	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	0	2
LITERACY	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1
LOBBYING	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
LOCAL AUTONOMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
LOCAL LIBRARIES	0	5	0	0	3	2	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	3	0	4
LSCA	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
MAIL SERVICE	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUSCRIPTS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
MARKETING	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MATCHING FUNDS	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1
MATCHING GRANTS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDIA	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	5	0	2	0	1	5	1	3	1	1	5	0	0	0	2	3	2
MEDICAL LIBRARY NETWORK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDICINE	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MENTAL HEALTH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
MENTALLY HANDICAPPED	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	1
MICROFORM	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
MINORITIES	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	1	1	1	0	3	0	0	0
MULTI TYPE LIBRARIES	4	8	3	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	1	5	4	1	2	2	0	2	0	10	2	0	1	3	3	1
MUSEUMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL INDIAN OMNIBUS LIBRARY BILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARIES	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARIES YEAR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY ACT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY AGENCY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL LOGO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL NETWORK	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	3	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0
NATIONAL PERIODICALS CENTER	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
NCLIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	1
NEEDS ASSESSMENT	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	1	3	1	2	3	2	1	4	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	2
NELINET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NETWORKING	4	6	1	2	5	1	3	1	3	9	2	5	2	2	9	2	0	2	1	1	0	6	8	0	2	5	0	0
NEW YORK TIMES DATA BASE	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEWSPAPERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
NHFRC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
NLSBPH	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NON PROFIT	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
NON USERS	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	[illegible]	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
OUTREACH	2	2	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	7	0	2	0	1	1
PARAPROFESSIONAL	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
PARENTS	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
PER CAPITA FUNDING	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
PERSONNEL	7	9	1	4	5	2	2	4	3	7	2	3	4	1	22	11	3	0	7	5	1	9	14	2	0	4	3	3
PHOTOCOPYING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
PHYSICAL ACCESS	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	1
PLANNING	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	2	6	0	0
PNBC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(Mississippi through Wyoming)

	MS	MT	NC	ND	NE	NH	NJ	NM	NV	NY	OH	OK	OR	PA	PR	RI	SC	TN	TT	TX	UT	VA	VI	VT	WA	WI	WV	WY
POLICY	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
POLITICS	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
POSTAL SERVICE	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0
PRESERVATION	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	0	2	0	1
PRESIDENT	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
PRIVACY	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
PRIVATE LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
PRIVATE SECTOR	1	4	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1
PROFESSIONALS	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
PUBLIC AWARENESS	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3	4
PUBLIC LIBRARIES	5	7	3	3	3	5	7	3	3	13	3	12	0	2	9	14	9	0	1	8	0	10	20	4	4	4	6	1
PUBLIC OPINION	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
PUBLIC RELATIONS	6	5	4	2	6	6	5	2	3	1	2	1	5	0	2	3	3	1	2	1	1	3	5	0	6	2	8	4
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PUBLISHING	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
RADIO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1
READING	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
READING IS FUNDAMENTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
RECORDED MATERIALS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
RECREATION	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
RECRUITMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
REFERENCE	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0
REFERENCE SERVICES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
REGIONAL	1	0	1	0	1	5	1	0	3	0	1	0	3	1	0	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0
REHABILITATION	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
RESEARCH	1	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	7	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	1
RESOURCE SHARING	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
RESOURCES	6	5	2	3	3	0	2	1	0	5	0	6	0	1	3	3	0	0	5	3	4	5	3	0	1	1	4	1
REVENUE SHARING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
RIGHT TO READ	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
RURAL	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
SALARY	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCHOLARSHIPS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL BOARDS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
SCHOOL LIBRARIES	4	1	2	1	0	3	2	3	3	5	1	5	2	3	14	8	12	1	0	2	1	3	20	5	5	4	6	4
SCHOOLS	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	1	2	1	2	4	2	3	0	3	2	0	3	6	1	0	2	3	3
SCIENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SECURITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1
SELECTION	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
SENIOR CITIZENS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
SIGN LANGUAGE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOLINET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPEAKERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPECIAL CONSTITUENCIES	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	2
SPECIAL LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
STANDARDS	2	2	1	1	4	0	4	2	4	2	0	3	4	2	4	6	2	2	3	2	0	7	7	2	2	6	3	3
STATE AGENCIES	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
STATE AID	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STATE CONSTITUTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
STATE FUNDING	1	3	6	2	3	13	12	9	10	5	1	7	0	8	0	6	9	0	0	6	0	5	0	7	4	13	1	3
STATE LIBRARY	0	11	9	8	17	17	9	3	10	7	0	8	8	5	0	6	6	2	0	5	2	6	0	4	11	3	2	14

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN STATE RESOLUTIONS
(Mississippi through Wyoming)

	MS	MT	NC	ND	NE	NH	NJ	NM	NV	NY	OH	OK	OR	PA	PR	RI	SC	TN	TT	TX	UT	VA	VI	VT	WA	WI	WV	WY
STATISTICS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STUDENTS	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	2	1	0
SUPREME COURT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TASK FORCE	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
TAX	3	7	0	2	1	1	0	2	4	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	2
TAX INCENTIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEACHERS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0
TECHNOLOGY	2	4	4	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	3	0	0	2	4	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	5	6	1	8
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
TELEPHONE SERVICES	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
TELEVISION	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	1	1
TOLL FREE TELEPHONE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRANSPORTATION	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
TRUSTEES	1	4	3	2	1	2	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	2	0	1	0
TTY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
TUTORIAL PROGRAMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
UNION LIST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
UNION LISTS	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	1
UNIVERSITY	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
URBAN	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
USERS	3	5	1	1	1	2	1	0	2	7	0	0	1	0	10	4	0	3	0	4	0	2	3	1	0	2	4	1
VIDEO	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
VOLUNTEERS	1	3	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	0
WELFARE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
WOMEN	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
WORKSHOPS	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
YOUTH	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	0

NOTE: Each resolution could deal with more than one subject.

Introduction

This is a report of the application of computer-mediated communications to the planning, reporting, and implementation of a national conference.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services was formally convened in Washington, D.C., in November, 1979. But the meeting was preceded by many months of planning, decision-making, discussion, and review. Beginning about six months before the delegates actually gathered, the last stage of planning involved the use of a computer-mediated telecommunications system known as EIES (Electronic Information Exchange System). With resources provided by the National Science Foundation, Texas Instruments, Inc., and volunteers on the EIES network, key members of the White House Conference group located in 17 States used electronic communications for much of their pre-Conference work.

At the Washington meeting the system was used to record much of the Conference activity for those on-site and elsewhere around the Nation; and after the Conference was over, it was used to coordinate subsequent implementation and reports.

This report is essentially a chronicle of the process. It uses observations and records of Conference-related on-line traffic and questionnaire surveys of the participants to illuminate such questions as:

- What was learned from this application of computer technology?
- If this use of computer conferencing were to be applied to a similar meeting in the future, what changes should be made?
- What are the optimum ways of combining face-to-face interaction, as in a conventional conference, with electronic interaction via a medium such as EIES?

This report is more a compendium of "lessons learned" than a sociological documentation of a formal experiment in which precise hypotheses are tested under controlled conditions. Since both the Conference and the use of EIES were innovative applications of an evolving technology, it seemed most reasonable to offer a detailed account of what transpired, with sensitivity to unexpected events and what can be learned from hindsight. It is hoped that this report will be of value both for documenting this particular application of computer-mediated communications and evaluating its utility for similar purposes in the future.

Elaine B. Kerr is a research consultant with the Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES). She received her Ph.D. in Sociology from Columbia University and is the author of numerous articles on computerized communications. She coordinated the use of EIES by the Conference Advisory Committee and staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title **Page**

ORIENTATION

Face-to-face meetings and on-line follow-up teaching of the system ... 769

CATEGORIZATION

The divisions of the WHCLIS group as presented statistically ... 769

ORGANIZATION

How the WHCLIS Subcommittee format was applied to EIES; analysis of Conference and notebook traffic ... 770

INITIAL USAGE

Problems in getting started ... 771

OVERALL USAGE

A statistical presentation and analysis of the various uses of EIES ... 772

USER ASSISTANCE

Explanation of the special user consulting provided for this group and analysis of the problems they had in using EIES ... 774

EIES AT WHCLIS

The special functions of EIES during the White House Conference ... 776

PRE-USE QUESTIONNAIRE

Analysis of a questionnaire administered on-line ... 777

POST-USE QUESTIONNAIRE

Analysis of the second questionnaire and comparison with the first ... 782

THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

A description of functions and user statistics ... 788

A NOTE ON THE METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION ON EIES

The various automated and manual procedures available for group evaluations ... 789

CONCLUSIONS ... 790

APPENDICES:

Comments from the participants ... 791
Tables ... 795

Orientation

On May 9, 1979, a presentation of the EIES system was made at a meeting of the Advisory Committee to Committee members and Conference staff in Washington, D.C. Following a brief introduction to the nature of computer conferencing, nine representatives of EIES, each with a terminal, demonstrated the system to training groups of four or five people. At one of two sessions Texas Instruments conducted, at which terminals were distributed, two EIES members were present to supplement specific terminal instructions with orientation to EIES. Face-to-face tutorials were later held with most of the staff members and with one Advisory Committee member; several lengthy phone tutorials were conducted when electronic connection was a problem; and these efforts were supplemented by considerable on-line facilitation and consulting.

Each user received a "welcoming message" when signing on line for the first time which explained how to get assistance in learning to use EIES. In addition, the staff conference moderators wrote separate welcoming messages to the members of their conferences.

Categorization

The 41 members of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services group (Group 26 on EIES) were divided into three categories:

A) Advisory Committee: 21 members (seven voluntarily chose not to participate in this computerized conferencing effort);

B) Staff: eight members (one of whom resigned during the project);

C) Observers: 12, of whom five were regular EIES users and seven were either affiliated with NCLIS or were consultants to the White House Conference.

This division among members of the White House Conference Advisory Committee, staff, and observers appears in many of the tables presented below. Some of these total 41 and others 36 representing respectively the total WHCLIS group (G26) or only members of the WHCLIS "billing group" (those whose funding source on line was from this project). In some cases statistics for the non-billing group users (the five EIES observers) were unavailable, and in other cases they are omitted because their inclusion would have distorted the meaning of the data, since they were also involved in many other on-line projects.

Organization

The organization of the WHCLIS effort on EIES mirrored the pre-existing subcommittee structure of the Advisory Committee, as well as permitting the later development of more fluid structures as needed. Each of the subcommittees was established as a separate EIES conference space:

C264 WHCLIS DELEGATE PREPARATION
C265 WHCLIS PROGRAM COMMITTEE
C266 WHCLIS IMPLEMENTATION
C270 WHCLIS PUBLIC RELATIONS
C271 WHCLIS DELEGATE SELECTION
C272 WHCLIS CONFERENCE INFORMATION CENTER
C288 WHCLIS LOGISTICS

Each conference was open to specific members, who could read the stored written transcripts of each others' comments and enter their own. A list of the conference members and how far each conferee had read was visible to each participant. Initial membership in these conferences was restricted to the official subcommittee members, as well as some of the EIES observers, with the staff person in charge of each area acting as that conference's moderator, admitting new members and editing the transcript if necessary. As the discussion of the various topics proceeded, others were added to the conference lists. (See Table 1 for the conference traffic analysis.)

In addition, all WHCLIS participants used a group conference (C26: WHCLIS INFORMATION) to share general information and subcommittee reports across the boundaries of other more specific activities.

Three other conferences emerged to meet concrete needs:

C231 WHCLIS EVALUATION
C279 CITIZEN GROUPS
C290 THE ROLE OF EIES AT WHCLIS

The notebook feature of EIES was also used as needed, although to a lesser extent than the conference structure (see Table 2).

This organization of the WHCLIS work into the conference structure of EIES permitted overlapping and changing conference memberships according to the participants' needs and interests.

The Advisory Committee members belonged to an average of four conferences each (with a range of one to six); Staff members belonged to an average of eight conferences (ranging from 5 to 10); and observers averaged six conferences (with a range of one to 11).

Although the EIES private and group messages were also used for more time-bound and temporary kinds of communications, no evaluation can be made of this message traffic other than in summary form (see Table 8), since the evaluator only had access to those messages addressed to her.

765

Tables 1 and 2 present an overview of the conference and notebook traffic for the WHCLIS GROUP. The data were manually collected on the first of each month by examining each conference for the size of its membership, number and size of the new conference comments, number of different authors, and the extent to which the members of that conference were up-to-date in reading the transcript. Since notebook memberships were not visible at that point in the development of EIES, notebook traffic data were simplified.

As expected, the subcommittee conference with the largest membership and most traffic was the group conference (C26: WHCLIS INFORMATION). This had been established as the space for general information-sharing across the boundaries of other more specific conferences.

As noted above, each of the seven subcommittees of the Advisory Committee was organized into its own conference. The membership size of these conferences was approximately equal, ranging from 15 to 21. But the amount of comments, or traffic in each conference space, differed somewhat, with the total number of conference comments ranging from 15 in C270: WHCLIS PUBLIC RELATIONS, to 54 in C272: WHCLIS CONFERENCE INFORMATION CENTER. The average size of the conference comments, however, was more even, ranging from 22 lines in C272, to 35 lines in C270. C270 and C272 apparently differed more in the intensity of the conference traffic than in actual usage.

The tables illustrate how conference participation, as measured by readership, increased gradually over time. These data are somewhat diluted by the presence of several users who never or very seldom signed into any conferences to which they belonged. Each was a relatively low-level user, however, in terms of total hours on line, essentially utilizing the system only for message traffic.

In almost all cases, nearly all conferees had either read most or all of the transcript by the end of the period, or had instead read almost nothing.

Of the three conferences which were established later, only C290: THE ROLE OF EIES AT WHCLIS, generated much activity. It was used by 12 WHCLIS members and 11 general EIES members to plan the demonstration of the EIES system at the White House Conference site itself. In addition, two notebooks: N237: EIES AT WHCLIS NOTEBOOK and N290: WHCLIS KEYWORD DATA, were used as backups for C290.

Initial Usage

The pattern of initial usage was uneven (see Table 3). At least two of the seven months of this project were spent starting up, while users acquired terminals, signed on line, and began to learn basic EIES mechanics. This time lag impeded the initial operations of the project, since the WHCLIS staff and EIES observers came on line well before the members of the Advisory Committee; yet the real work of the group could not begin until the Committee had come on line and become acclimated to using the system.

An expected and normal amount of fumbling, common to new users who are learning to use a different mode of communicating, was largely responsible for the slow start. System malfunctions, many "normal" in the sense that EIES is an evolving research effort rather than a more fixed and predictable commercial system, also contributed to some user problems. An additional factor was the relatively low usage of EIES by a few key people in the WHCLIS effort. The great pressure of time in which to accomplish the work was a tension-producing factor, and it is therefore suggested that an earlier introduction of EIES into the WHCLIS planning effort would have been advantageous to both goal achievement and a more relaxed learning atmosphere.

Users had significant problems in actually beginning to use EIES. The initial training session on May 9 was held almost two months before most received their terminals and signed on line. By that time, much of the training itself and the explanatory materials distributed at that session had been lost or forgotten.

Adjusting to the intricacies of intelligent terminals was a second major problem. The capabilities of the Texas Instruments Model 765 Bubble Memory Terminal far exceeded the requirements of the EIES system. Although it offered the opportunity for off-line composition, which if facilely used could have saved members much connect time, in fact only four WHCLIS members learned any of these routines and none became adept at them. It was the presence of these advanced technological opportunities that ironically acted as an impediment to the EIES experience, in that beginners tended to confuse the features and requirements of the terminal itself with those of the EIES system. The recommendation, then, is that "dumb" rather than "intelligent" terminals be used whenever possible for new users.

Overall Usage

Tables 4 through 9 present some general statistics on the use of EIES by the WHCLIS group. Each is presented for members of the three categories (staff, Advisory Committee, and observers) who were active in a particular category during that month, rather than for the entire group, so that the data would not be diluted by those who had not yet signed on line, who were off-line for that period, or who were inactive in the usage category. The overall number of active users is presented in Table 4.

Scanning these tables, the general conclusion is that usage increased through August, September, and October, and then declined, with the data resembling a normal distribution. Data are rounded to the nearest whole number and can be divided by the number of active users to determine the averages for those active on line.

Table 5 is probably the most interesting, in that it indicates the amount of actual usage of the EIES system. These data slightly underreport the amount of real use, since time spent in off-line composition in the bubble memory is not included. The eight staff members accounted for 38 percent of the total hours used, whereas the Advisory Committee's usage was less than their proportionate representation. This supports the qualitative impression of the staff's greater activity through carrying the bulk of the administrative work. It was only in October and November that the Advisory Committee's usage was relatively high. Although use by the staff peaked in August, the Advisory Committee continued relatively high activity through November, and time on line by the observers increased steadily until December.

Table 6 presents the actual number of times users signed onto EIES. The pattern resembles Table 5, although observers were disproportionately represented in these statistics.

Table 7 was constructed by dividing the total hours on line by the number of sign-ons to derive the average amount of time on line in minutes per session. After the first month, during which it was rather high for all three groups, probably because of training and general acclimation, the numbers tended to increase slightly over time. The length of on-line sessions apparently lengthened with familiarity with the system, even though the absolute usage declined after a midway peak, possibly because they were increasingly busy off line. The staff averaged 21 minutes per session, compared with 13 minutes for the Advisory Committee and 10 minutes for the observers.

Table 8 presents the changing number of other EIES members, both within and outside the WHCLIS group, to whom private messages were sent. The greatest activity for the group as a whole was during the month of August, but there were internal variations. Although the staff activity peaked in August, September and October continued to be heavy months in the number of people addressed. Usage by the Advisory Committee was steadier, with fairly heavy traffic from July through October. The staff's previously documented greater usage is greatly reduced for the number of addressees, accounting for 40 percent of the total, compared with 37 percent for the Advisory Committee.

Table 9 presents the varying uses made of the different components of the EIES system. Although messages, especially private messages, were utilized far more extensively than were either the conference or notebook spaces, this is somewhat deceiving, in that the conferences tended to be used for relatively rigid and specified tasks. Also, some items originally appearing in private messages were later transferred to conference comments. Furthermore, many of the private messages and some of the group messages were requests for help and facilitation.

Participation in the public conferences was deliberately discouraged because of the time constraints on the group's work, except for one public conference on Library Futures to which members were specifically directed. It may be that this whetted their appetites for exploring other public conferences, but this cannot be directly determined.

Little use was made of notebooks, which represent a stepping-off point for many of the more advanced features available on the system. Notebooks are spaces designed for storage of text and customized programmed procedures, composition of complex items prior to submission, and co-authorship.

The number of items received greatly exceeds those composed because of the "throughput" nature of computerized communications. Multiple addresses for messages and large conference memberships mean that the user receives far more text material than the amount he or she enters into the system. (The data for group messages are somewhat exaggerated, since the group evaluator, who composed 121 of these messages, is not included in the statistics.) The circulation ratio, or average number of persons receiving an item was: for private messages, 2.2; for conferences, 20.7; and for public conferences, 79.8.

User Assistance

From the perspective of EIES, WHCLIS represented a somewhat unusual user group, in that it operated with tight deadlines and closely defined goals. On the other hand, it resembled other user groups on line in terms of size, geographic dispersion, mixture of staff and advisory group, and task.

Because of these kinds of factors, the author of this report, as an experienced user of the EIES system and coordinator of its user consultants, assumed the task of facilitating the effort. Responsibilities included coordination, basic training and orientation for both the staff and the Advisory Committee, monitoring the proceedings, documenting the use of the system, linking the implementation and programming staffs, managing time allocations, demonstrating the system at the Conference in November, and evaluating the overall effort. This was a very specialized, intense, and focused kind of user consulting compared to that which is offered general users of the EIES system.

An on-line file (conference 253) was maintained with questions and responses to user problems. These questions ranged from the simple mechanics of how to use the system to various kinds of facilitation, teaching advanced features, and consulting on policy decisions relating to the work of the WHCLIS group on the EIES system.

Access to this conference was restricted to five people (the author and observers from EIES and WHCLIS) who maintained the confidentiality of the user materials that appeared there. Moreover, any item with either personal or extraneous text was edited before being copied into the file.

An analysis of user problems spanned 535 items entered in conference 253 between May 2 and December 31, 1979. These requests from users do not necessarily correspond on a one-to-one basis with items in the file, since many messages contained multiple requests, some were thank you notes, and others included unsolicited suggestions to users when problems were spotted of which they had been unaware.

The tabulation was made by number of user requests. Often each request involved two or more communications: one with the original question, one in response with the answer, and frequently further questions or applications being suggested afterwards. Both the length and time span, then, are variable. There are six categories of user requests, although users generally did not associate their requests with these or any categories (see Table 10). These categories conform to the major components of the EIES system and provide a useful framework within which to organize requests that, in practice, frequently crosscut areas of specific concern.

"General usage problems," such as difficulties with terminals or logging on, were far more characteristic of the earlier than later WHCLIS users. For example, "terminal interface problems," or problems of adjusting to the complexities of the intelligent Texas Instruments terminal, were generally overcome within the first month of use. Similarly, the category of "help in getting started for new users, general facilitation" required the facilitator to work intensely at first with novices who only occasionally needed this kind of aid after becoming used to the system.

Some of the problems, such as setting the network to half duplex, signing off line, modifying conference comments, and adding members to an existing conference were of a mechanical "how to" nature. Others involved coordination, linkage, and policy, as in establishing new conferences, suggesting general organization and norms, messaging etiquette, and linking with nongroup users on EIES.

The WHCLIS users, by and large, did not get involved with the advanced features available on EIES, essentially limiting their exchanges to the messaging and conferencing systems.

The data in Table 11 were collected by a simple count of the conference comments in C253, to show the uneven pattern of requests for assistance and facilitation over time. This is only a rough approximation, since the units here were not the number of requests, as was the case elsewhere, but rather the absolute number of request-response sets. When compared with Table 9, these data suggest that there was a lag of several weeks before new users felt sufficiently comfortable with the basic mechanics of using the system to be aware of just what questions they wished to ask and which electronic paths they chose to explore. The number of requests for assistance resembles a normal distribution curve, with a slow start, gradual buildup hitting a peak at the end of August, and then a rather steady decline (see Table 11).

An examination of the number of requests for help and facilitation per user produced Table 12. Almost half the members used relatively little of the on-line help available to them, whereas others were disproportionately heavy in their requests for assistance. The mean number of requests was 30.3. Help was needed, given, and used, but the reasons why some took greater advantage of it than others cannot be completely determined. To this researcher, the six users requesting the most help were also the most enthusiastic about EIES as a communications medium; but this impression might be spurious, in that the researcher became best acquainted with those who communicated most with her on line.

The number of requests for help varied directly with the amount of time spent on line (see Table 13). While most of those spending relatively little time on line made comparatively few requests for help, those with more time on line were more evenly divided, suggesting that time on line alone is not a complete explanation. A comparison of these data with Table 11 shows that requests declined after the basic learning mechanics were mastered. Further questions began to lead the users into more advanced applications of the EIES system.

EIES at WHCLIS

The Electronic Information Exchange System was featured at the White House Conference as a major component of a working Information Center, designed by the Library of Congress for the delegates to use in drafting their recommendations and as a prototype library of the future. EIES was used for a variety of purposes:

- Continuous reporting of Conference activities;
- Connecting various working groups to one another through electronic reports and messages, and allowing both delegates and nondelegates to monitor the progress of all working groups;
- Demonstrating a new technology for the sharing of communication and information;
- Reporting White House Conference activities to EIES users and guests unable to be physically present;
- Allowing interaction among the Conference and three remote sites in Hawaii, Kansas City, and New Jersey;
- Permitting communication between the delegates and supporting groups in their home States, including pre-Conference participants, State-level advisory committees, and State government officials;
- Categorizing and indexing the keyworks collected from the State pre-Conference resolutions.

EIES public conference 1028 was established as an on-line site for viewing reports from the 34 working groups, summaries of plenary sessions, drafts of resolutions, testimony at open public hearings, and comments from those connected both electronically and at the site. A group of graduate library student volunteers assisted in entering a total of 478 comments. Additionally, EIES public notebook 1028 served a smaller communications function, acting as a news-and-feature service with background information, features, and general Conference updates.

A special software filtering routine was written on EIES by James Whitescarver to permit flexible and customized interfacing between accessers of these spaces and their changing needs. Typing + WHCLIS or + WHCNEWS allowed users to access either the public conference or the public notebook and selectively choose only those topics they wished to follow, by associations to other comments or by keywords. Branching structures, and batch or nobatch options, were also part of this software package.

The resulting compilation of resolutions from the pre-Conference, on-line copies of the recommendations made by the delegates, and the final resolutions passed at the White House Conference make it possible to trace the legislative history of given issues in the national culmination of the Conference process.

EIES occupied one of the five major sections of the Information Center, with seven people representing the system, approximately 25 working terminals for input, demonstration, and printouts, and a scrolling terminal with video monitor presenting continuous display of the Conference's progress. Posted printouts also permitted manual scanning.

Pre-Use Questionnaire

Pre- and post-use questionnaires were written and administered on line to elicit descriptive statistics and changes over time, and to help determine whether the experience of communicating on EIES actually had an impact on the WHCLIS work process. The pre-use questionnaire was issued June 27 and responded to almost immediately by seven people. Follow-up reminder messages to nonrespondents were sent August 10 and August 27. Each of the two follow-ups produced seven additional responses. Six of the eight staff people responded, as did 14 of the 22 Advisory Committee members, and one of the seven non-EIES observers. EIES observers were omitted from the data analysis, as their responses were not comparable. The 21 respondents represented 57 percent of the total number eligible to respond.

The questionnaire was distributed via RESPOND, a software system on EIES developed by Peter and Trudy Johnson-Lenz. Written in INTERACT, a programming language embedded within the EIES system, RESPOND is used to design, administer, and tabulate on-line survey questionnaires. The most common application, to date, has been to survey participants in various groups about their reactions to the EIES system.

Advantages of computerized conferencing surveys over mail questionnaires include: decreased time and effort for survey design and data collection; option for respondents who do not understand a question to send a message requesting clarification; higher response rates than in mailed questionnaires; possible complex branching; and options for multi-round Delphi studies with feedback to participants between rounds.

PRE-USE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your cooperation in completing the following questionnaire, before you participate in the system for more than an hour or so, is vitally necessary for a thorough and proper evaluation of the use that WHCLIS makes of the EIES system. These questions are designed to collect some information on general background and communication style. You should be able to complete the answers to this questionnaire in about 15 minutes. If you choose not to respond to a particular question, you may do this simply by hitting CARRIAGE RETURN.

1. What is your age?

-	Under 25	8	45-54
1	25-34	4	55-64
7	35-44	1	65 or over

2. Sex:

10	Female
11	Male

3. Please indicate the amount of formal education you have completed:

-	Grammar school or less
-	Some high school
-	High school graduate
-	Some college
1	College graduate
3	Some graduate school
16	Graduate degree
1	Abstain

4. How would you describe your reading speed?

4	Very fast
14	Fast
3	Slow
-	Very slow

5. Comparing your writing skills and your speaking skills, would you say you were more persuasive when:

7	Writing
13	Speaking
1	Abstain

6. How would you describe your typing skills?

1	None
3	Hunt and peck
7	Casual (rough draft with errors)
3	Good (can do 25 w.p.m. error free)
6	Excellent (can do 40 w.p.m. error free)
1	Abstain

7. I think computers are:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
wonderful			neutral			terrible	Abstain
9	4	2	5	-	-	-	1

8. Have you ever used computers or computer terminals before?

8	Never
7	Seldom
5	Frequently
1	Abstain

9. Have you ever utilized a computerized messaging system, teleconferencing, or computerized conferencing system before?

4	Yes
16	No
1	Abstain

(If yes, please let me know in a private message which systems you have used.)

10. Please describe your present impressions of the degree of cooperation and cohesion within the WHCLIS group.

1	2	3	4	5	
Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Low	Nonexistent	Abstain
1	5	11	2	-	2

11. Of all the members of the WHCLIS group, please estimate how many you consider to be professional colleagues with whom you have either previously communicated or become familiar with their work.

1	None
9	Fewer than 5
5	5-10
2	11-15
1	16-20
-	21-25
-	26 or more
3	Abstain

12. Of all the members of the WHCLIS group, please estimate how many you consider to be personal friends.

6	None
2	1
4	2
1	3
3	4
2	5
2	6 or more
1	Abstain

13. Concerning the user information brochure about EIES, check one of the following.

2	Did not receive a brochure
4	Received a brochure, but haven't read it
6	Found the brochure easy to understand
4	Found the brochure hard to understand
2	Read the brochure, but can't evaluate it
3	Abstain

14. Which feature of the conferencing system do you anticipate as being most useful to you?

8	Private messaging between individuals
9	Group discussion and conferencing
-	Text editing features
-	Personal notebooks
-	Bulletin
-	Searching the conference records
1	Use of anonymous comments or pen names
-	Other (please specify in a private message to me)
3	Abstain

15. How much time in the average week do you foresee yourself using EIES?

2	30 minutes or less
5	30 minutes to 1 hour
4	1-3 hours
7	4-6 hours
1	6-9 hours
-	9 hours or more
2	Abstain

16. How often do you foresee yourself signing on the system to send or receive messages or discussion comments?

-	Once a month or less
2	2-3 times a month
1	Once a week
7	Two or three times a week
6	Daily
3	Several times a day
2	Abstain

17. Do you anticipate entering the material into the system YOURSELF or having someone else do it for you?

12	Type it myself
2	Have it typed
5	Both will occur
2	Abstain

18. Which of the following best describes your anticipation of the system's worth?

- I think it will be useless
- I think it is useful for others, but not for WHCLIS
1 I am skeptical about it but willing to try it
1 I am basically indifferent or neutral
4 I think it will have limited, but some, worth for WHCLIS
8 I think it will be useful in many respects
4 I think it will revolutionize WHCLIS's work/communication processes
2 It depends (please specify in a private message to me)
1 Abstain

19. Compared to the conventional means of communicating with the WHCLIS Advisory Committee and staff, do you expect EIES to:

8 Involve less of your time
9 Involve more of your time
2 Involve the same amount of your time
2 Abstain

If you would like to make additional comments, please put them in a private message to me.

Elaine B. Kerr
EIES Research Consultant

The demographic characteristics indicate that this was a well-educated, middle-aged, egalitarian group. As might be expected, they perceived themselves as fast readers, casual typists, and more persuasive when speaking than writing. As beginners on EIES, they had a positive attitude toward computers, even though eight had no prior experience with either computers or terminals. Four indicated they had used some kind of electronic mail system before, but gave no details, even though this was requested in the questionnaire. Concerning the existing WHCLIS group, they perceived moderate to strong cohesion, several who were considered to be colleagues, and most had at least one personal friend in the group.

Their attitudes toward the EIES system at that point were moderately favorable: half of those who had read the Users' Guide rated it favorably. They were evenly divided in expecting to use the messaging and conferencing components of EIES. More than half expected to sign on line at least once a day, using the system an average of four to six hours a week. Half anticipated typing the material themselves. And just over half indicated very positive attitudes toward the system's potential utility for their group. (The degree of this positive pre-evaluation was somewhat surprising, in that the last alternative was worded to be somewhat exaggerated.) Finally, they were split in terms of expecting EIES to involve more or less of their time compared with conventional means of communicating.

One of the three private messages received in response to this questionnaire was particularly predictive: "This is really a mixed group of people; and given the relatively short amount of time they have to get over any initial barriers they may have with learning to use this kind of a communications system, I would anticipate very uneven results."

A number of cross-tabulations were manually constructed to determine if some of the attitudinal responses to the pre-use questionnaire were correlated with actual usage of the EIES system. The cumulative time used on line as of December 18 was used as the final data point for these analyses. Although the numbers were small, some patterns did emerge. No relationships were found with amount of use and these three variables: reading speed (Q.4), feeling more persuasive when speaking vs. writing (Q.5), and attitude toward computers (Q.7). There was a strong and positive relationship between perceived typing skills and amount of time spent using EIES, with those rating their typing skills as "casual" to "excellent" spending considerably more time on line. This suggests that typing, as a component of perceived ease of using the system, had both an attitudinal and mechanical impact as an enabling factor on actual usage (see Table 14).

Previous use of computers and terminals was also related to the amount of EIES use, suggesting a second factor incorporating both attitudes and skills (see Table 15). And the data in Table 16 indicates that pre-use attitudes about the anticipated worth of EIES to their work produced the strongest relationship with actual use. Finally, those who expected using EIES to save them time rather than cost them time were far more likely to use the system extensively (see Table 17).

Post-Use Questionnaire

A corresponding post-use questionnaire was issued on November 27, to which 10 users responded quickly. Follow-up reminders were sent to nonrespondents on December 19 and January 17, producing another five returns. In addition, copies were mailed to the 11 people who no longer had terminals, resulting in another five returns. In all, the 20 respondents represented a 56 percent response rate.

Five were staff members, 12 were Advisory Committee members, and three were observers. Of the 20, 16 had also responded to the pre-use questionnaire.

POST-USE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your cooperation in completing the following questionnaire is vitally necessary for a thorough evaluation of the use that WHCLIS has made of the EIES system. These questions are designed to collect some information about your communication style and experiences using this system. You should be able to complete it in about 15 minutes. If you choose not to respond to a particular question, you may do this by hitting CR (Carriage Return).

1. Comparing your writing skills and your speaking skills, would you say you were more persuasive when:

7	Writing
10	Speaking
3	Abstain

2. I think computers are:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
wonderful			neutral			terrible	Abstain
6	8	3	2	-	-	-	1

3. Please describe your present impressions of the degree of cooperation and cohesion within the WHCLIS group:

1	2	3	4	5	
Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Low	Nonexistent	Abstain
3	5	10	1	-	1

4. Of all the members of the WHCLIS Advisory Committee, please estimate how many you consider to be professional colleagues since you began using EIES?

1	None
8	Fewer than 5
4	5-10
-	11-15
4	16-20
1	21-25
-	26 or more
2	Abstain

5. Of all the members of the WHCLIS group, please estimate how many you consider to be personal friends.

1	None
2	1
2	2
2	3
1	4
3	5
9	6 or more

6. Which feature of the conferencing system did you find most useful?

11	Private messaging between individuals
9	Group discussion and conferencing
-	Text editing features
-	Personal notebooks
-	Searching the conference records
-	Use of anonymous comments or pen names
-	Other (please specify in a private message to me)

7. How often did you sign on the system to send or receive messages or discussion comments?

-	Once a month or less
1	2-3 times a month
3	Once a week
9	Two or three times a week
3	Daily
4	Several times a day

8. Did you enter the material into the system yourself or have someone else do it for you?

15	Typed it myself
1	Had it typed
3	Both occurred
1	Abstain

9. Which of the following best describes your evaluation of the system's worth?

-	I think it was useless
-	I think it was useful for others, but not for WHCLIS
1	I am still skeptical about it
-	I am basically indifferent or neutral
5	I think it had limited, but some, worth for WHCLIS
6	I think it was useful in many respects
8	I think it revolutionized WHCLIS's work/communication processes
-	It depends (please specify in a private message to me)

10. Compared to the conventional means of communicating with the WHCLIS Advisory Committee and staff, did EIES:

7	Involve less of your time
6	Involve more of your time
3	Involve the same amount of your time
4	Abstain

11. Use of EIES has increased my productivity in terms of the QUALITY of work recently completed or underway.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Abstain
2	5	9	2	-	2

12. Use of EIES has increased my productivity in terms of the QUANTITY of work recently completed or underway.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Abstain
-	9	5	4	-	2

13. Use of EIES has increased my effectiveness as a member of the WHCLIS group.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Abstain
5	8	4	2	-	1

14. Use of EIES has increased my "stock of ideas" that might be used in future work.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Abstain
9	4	3	1	-	3

15. Has the use of EIES changed the amount of your use of other media? What about the telephone?

-	Increased
8	No effect
7	Decreased
5	Abstain

16. What about the mails?

-	Increased
8	No effect
10	Decreased
2	Abstain

17. What about travel to meetings?

-	Increased
7	No effect
10	Decreased
3	Abstain

18. During the time that you have been a member of EIES, have you noticed that it has had any impacts on the way in which you think and work, in general?

5	No
12	Yes
3	Abstain

(If yes, please describe these impacts in as much detail as possible in a private message to me.)

19. Comparing my contributions or effort put into EIES with the amount of information received, I feel that I have:

-	Contributed significantly more than I have received
-	Contributed more than I have received
4	About equal
8	Received more than I have contributed
3	Received significantly more than I have contributed
5	Abstain

I welcome any additional comments you might care to make, and ask that you put them in a private message to me. Specifically, I am interested in your responses to the following questions:

1) What one or two factors best explain why you have not used EIES more?
2) Are there any particular features of EIES you have found to be (please describe and comment):
   a) Unique and valuable to this type of system?
   b) Useless, distracting, and/or out of place in this type of system?
   c) What general improvements/new features/changes would you like to suggest for EIES?
3) Any other comments on the EIES system or its impacts, or on this questionnaire?

Elaine Kerr
EIES Research Consultant

The changes that had occurred seven months after the system's inception can now be examined. For only two variables, no significant changes were discernible for the group as a whole:

- The proportion feeling they were more persuasive when writing than when speaking (perhaps they had not been on EIES long enough for this to have an impact).
- About half expected, and about half found, the private message and group conferencing systems to be the most useful aspects of EIES. (As a group, they did not explore the more complex features available on the system.)

Scanning the responses to questions 11 through 19 gives an impression of the perceived overall utility of the system:

- Far more agreed than disagreed that EIES had a positive impact on the quality and quantity of their work, as well as their "stock of ideas" and group effectiveness.
- Supportive evidence for the cost effectiveness of computerized communications is provided by the majority, who said it had decreased their use of telephone, travel, and mail.
- Twelve of 17 perceived an impact on their general modes of thinking and working.
- 11 of 15 felt they had received more than they had contributed.

There was a positive change over time in the group's attitude toward computers in general, with an increase from 75 to 85 percent of positive ratings.

Impressions of the degree of group cooperation and cohesion increased, with 32 percent rating it as strong or very strong at the beginning and 42 percent at the end. There is, of course, no way of knowing how much of this increase was a function of the group's working together over time and how much would have taken place even in the absence of EIES.

The number considered to be professional colleagues increased over time (see Table 18). When the data are confined to those responding at both points in time, and abstentions are eliminated, this was found to vary directly with total time used on line. Those interacting on EIES more intensely with their group members were more likely to experience an increase in the number they perceived to be colleagues. The number of personal friendships also increased substantially over time, with a similar pattern according to time spent on line (see Table 19).

The frequency with which they reported they had signed on line was checked against the actual number of times signed on and the total amount of time used as a validity check, which on the whole was essentially accurate (see Table 20). There was little discrepancy between the expected frequency of sign on and reported actual frequency, with a slight tendency to sign on more often than had been anticipated (see Table 21).

The expected mode of working with EIES, by either typing the material oneself, having it entered by someone else, or a combination of these two, was with two exceptions carried out. As indicated in Table 22, those who did their own typing spent much more time on line than those who did not, suggesting that the experience of interacting with the system itself was reinforcing in leading to activities other than what had been anticipated when signing on line.

Overall evaluation of the worth of EIES increased over the seven months. With possible scores ranging between a low of one and a high of seven, the mean score at the beginning was 5.7 and at the end was 6.0. Those who responded to both questionnaires, with one exception, were more favorably disposed toward the system's worth as time passed (see Table 23). As was true for pre-use attitudes toward the worth of EIES, post-use attitudes were also directly related to the total time spent on line (see Table 24).

At both the beginning and the end, the group was about evenly divided as to whether EIES would or did involve more or less of their time than conventional means of communicating. However, many switched their positions over time (see Table 25). Those who at the start had expected EIES to save them time were more likely to use the system frequently. At the conclusion, however, those who felt that EIES had involved more of their time had, in fact, spent considerably more time on line (see Table 26).

The impact of the system on perceived productivity was considered in terms of both quality and quantity of "work recently completed or underway." Although the group's "vote" was favorable to EIES in both cases, the two components of productivity were not completely correlated with each other (see Table 27). Perceptions of the effect on both quality and quantity were also related to time spent on line, suggesting that the positive impact of EIES increased linearly with use (see Tables 28 and 29).

Although there was strong agreement that "use of EIES has increased my effectiveness as a member of the WHCLIS group" (13 to two), this was not related to average time spent on line. This was also the case for increasing one's "stock of ideas" (13 to one). Although Q.19 indicated that 11 of 15 felt they had received more from EIES than they had contributed, this too was unrelated to time spent on line.

The responses to inquiries about the effects of the system on use of telephone, travel, and mail were positive and interrelated (see Table 30). All except four users saw at least some increase in cost-effectiveness. The dissenters used an average of 26.9 hours of time on line, compared with 33.6 for the others responding to this questionnaire, suggesting that perhaps in fact for them it was less cost-effective. The four finding the system more cost-effective (saying that it had decreased use of all three other media) averaged 61.0 hours on line. Those who found that EIES had had an impact "on the way in which you think and work, in general" had spent twice as much time on line compared with those who reported no impact (see Table 31).

The Role of the Researcher

Although the role of the researcher as both group facilitator and evaluator posed some potential methodological dilemmas for participant observation, this in fact was not a major problem because of awareness of the situation, because the two efforts were separated in time segments, and because the relevant statistics were collected and presented separately.

The use of EIES by WHCLIS represented the first time that a large-scale coordination effort of this type was conducted. In addition to the normal user consulting functions available to all users of the EIES system (basic training, general orientation, people brokering, and teaching advanced features), the researcher was responsible for general coordination, monitoring all conferences and notebooks, participating in policy decisions as to the usage of this electronic communications medium, time management and allocations, linkage with programmers for developing the required special software, and managing the presentation of the EIES system on-site at the White House Conference.

The researcher's usage statistics therefore are qualitatively different from those of the individual members of the WHCLIS group. They indicate, in part, the amount of time, effort, and computer space required to coordinate this kind of effort (see Table 32). In addition to the effort documented in this table, it is important to note the invaluable assistance provided by three other members of the EIES team who acted as "consultants to the consultant": Starr Roxanne Hiltz, who is the EIES evaluator; Charlton Price, who was responsible for the initial link between EIES and WHCLIS; and Murray Turoff,

783

who designed and administers the EIES system. In an important sense, this entire effort represented a new organizational form in which geographically dispersed colleagues interacted electronically to generate a specific task and workable product.

A Note on the Methodology of Evaluation of EIES

A number of usage statistics are automatically collected and stored in the EIES computer. Users can access data about themselves, and the group coordinator and evaluator can also access information about both the group and specific members. Data presented here and elsewhere, however, reflect usage made either by the group as a whole or categories of users, rather than individuals, since the latter information is considered private and confidential. Data about individual users were examined only for aggregate purposes; the text of private messages was not and cannot be examined.

The following data were systematically collected and examined:

+TIMESTAT: presents time usage statistics for members of a specified billing group. (Billing groups on EIES are those through which line time is funded. They do not usually fully coincide with EIES groups, since there may well be group participants whose funding is external to the billing group. Five such nonbilling group general EIES users existed in this case.) +TIMESTAT makes visible, by user, the amount of time allocated, total time used to date, amount of time remaining, and amount of time used during the previous month.

+TIMEBGST: presents individual usage statistics monthly, to examine who is using the system and the frequency of using each of its component parts. Data are presented for the previous month and the total to date for the number of items and component lines composed and received for private and group messages; private, group, and public conferences; private, group, and public notebooks; total number of times on; total hours and minutes of use; and total private message addressees.

The changing group status per month and over time was examined monthly with a review of group status command. This is visible to any member of the group and presents the individual usage statistics as outlined above, aggregated for the group as a whole. These data reflect the entire EIES group, rather than only the billing group.

Each of the group's 10 conferences and four notebooks were examined monthly, in order to manually collect the data presented in Tables 1 and 2. Upon entering any EIES conference, users are asked if they wish to examine the "conference status," which presents the name of each conference member and the extent to which they are up-to-date in the proceedings.

Questions and responses from users were copied into a separate conference for various kinds of analyses, as presented in Tables 10-13. These were also non-automated procedures.

Finally, pre- and post-use questionnaires were written and administered on line, as described above.

Conclusions

WHCLIS' use of EIES was the first application of this computerized conferencing system for planning and management of a large-scale national meeting. As such, the results of this exercise are of interest to those involved with the WHCLIS effort, those at NCLIS responsible for implementing the results of the Conference, designers and other concerned users of EIES, and those considering using computer conferencing for similar purposes.

The methodology for evaluating the use made of the EIES system by groups coming on line to accomplish specific tasks is new and evolving. Although evaluation has been an ongoing component of EIES since its inception in 1976, focused applications of evaluation techniques to groups planning a national meeting such as WHCLIS was a new test both for the system and for its evaluational research. We were concerned, in this case, with understanding the impact of computer-mediated communications on the nature of the WHCLIS group and the individuals' work, with determining to what degree the use of this system facilitates the achievement of the group's goals, and with finding ways in which the system can be changed to the advantage of current and future users.

EIES is an evolving system for research and development on computer-mediated communication. One of its functions is to provide a facility in which groups can experiment with new applications for this medium. User groups' cooperation with the evaluational research program makes it possible to discover the particular advantages and disadvantages of this technology for specific kinds of user groups and applications. The major long-term goal of EIES is to develop a computer and information technology that permits the structuring of human group communications to the needs and applications of individual user groups.

None of these questions or concerns can be answered in a simple "yes" or "no" manner. Surely the White House Conference could have been planned and held, even if the communications capabilities of EIES had not been used. There are strong indications, however, that the Conference pre-planning was made more efficient and less expensive because of the presence of EIES.

This is not to say that if we could redo the effort, changes would not be made. There was no need for terminals with built-in memories for off-line composition; simpler terminals and therefore simpler and shorter training sessions would have encouraged greater use of the system by more participants. Yet initial training should have been more intensive and more face-to-face, rather than largely on line (mostly to repeat basics and/or undo misunderstandings stemming from the face-to-face training sessions that were held). Refraining from supplementing EIES training materials by phone calls and mail to those not choosing to sign on early and regularly might have motivated these diffident members to be more active on line. Since the key to effective results from this kind of communications system is regular usage, providing incentives for greater participation would have been helpful. Finally, according to several WHCLIS staff members, the earlier introduction of EIES into the WHCLIS effort, such as at the time of the State pre-Conferences, would have made the system even more helpful for conference planning and administration.

Further information about this report may be obtained from:

Elaine B. Kerr
264 East South Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Further information about EIES may be obtained from:

Anita Graziano
Administrative Assistant, EIES
New Jersey Institute of Technology
323 High Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

APPENDIX A

COMMENTS FROM THE PARTICIPANTS

(Responses to Open-Ended Questionnaire Items)

Q1) What one or two factors best explain why you have not used EIES more?

- Wish we had had access earlier. Some Advisory Committee members did not learn to use the system. I did not fully utilize it until quite late, and then went abroad. Some of the reports tended to be overly long and poorly composed, I felt, but that may be because of the time schedule.

- The only pressures were the need to sleep and to continue the obligations of a life that already consumed 16 to 18 hours a day. But for that, I would have signed on EIES regularly once a day, for 16 hours each time.

- The factors that interfered with a more intensive use of the system were: 1) lack of response from other participants; 2) slow response rate of the system at some crucial times; 3) some difficulties in use of the TI terminal features (i.e., Bubble Memory is great, but there were times that the automated functions ran away with the operation); 4) the verbal diarrhea of some participants, producing such a flood of output as to destroy communication.

- Probably because I had nothing to say. I found it very valuable in extracting information from the staff.

- Lack of effective training in system use.

- EIES was introduced into WHCLIS planning process too late to realize its full potential.

- I'm only sorry there wasn't time to do it right.

Q2a) Are there any particular features of EIES that you have found to be unique and valuable to this type of system?

- Opportunity for everyone to be informed.

- I think EIES has started my thinking into new tracks about how the communication process can be improved in my other work.

- It helped to remind me that I had a much wider circle of professional colleagues than I had realized. It put teleconferencing in sharper focus for me. It stimulated new thought about other applications. It provided me with new insights about the social implication aspects of professional conferencing.

- I feel that this new process directly contributed to the success of our Conference. Without the terminals and the electronic means to communicate, we would not have been able to do such thorough planning. . . . This way the staff and members could be kept up-to-date on all the new developments. If a crucial issue had to be resolved, the members got on line to present personal views for the solution.

- Avenue for exchange of ideas without calling a meeting. Value extended only to messages between persons who signed on with sufficient frequency.

- The most important item is that people can talk to each other through the medium of conference, and it does not seem as though I am using a mechanical device. After the first few days, the terminal became human and was able to transmit my thoughts as though I was face-to-face with the person at the other end of the line. I got to know many of the WHCLIS staff and Advisory Committee members better after communicating with them on line. To be able to communicate informally, letting someone who is not very aggressive in a meeting speak out, or rather print out, thoughts at his own speed, made it possible for everyone who really got into the conferencing to be more effective. I did not have to compete with others talking at a meeting, but could write out my messages, get information into a conference, or get answers back in my own time. This might have been the middle of the night, as well as during the day.

- I felt the use of the EIES system was excellent for the WHCLIS purposes.

- I see many benefits that could be accomplished with the use of conferencing terminals—faster, easier ways to communicate with people in a like field; ease of operation that would put libraries and information services into the 21st century; and possibilities for the very young of this country to be able to use it for access to greater areas of information.

- It saved thousands of dollars over the alternative, the WHCLIS staff having to meet with the Advisory Committee in Washington. Many questions could be put on the terminal; comment could be and was received by them and from the Committee; and a much stronger policy, conference program, and delegate selection was accomplished via the terminal. I feel it had much to do with the extraordinary success of the White House Conference.

Q2b) Are there any particular features of EIES that you have found to be useless, distracting, and/or out of place in this type of system?

- Some of the ways of presenting the successive menus were distracting. I think the system includes means for me to have avoided them, but it was never worth the effort to find out how.

- I didn't find it at any time useless, distracting, or out of place.

- It is not distracting. It is quiet and rather simple to operate. Although I did not take the time to really use the editing system, I did use the Bubble Memory and used the machine to type off line.

Q2c) What general improvements/new features/changes would you like to suggest for EIES?

- There were several occasions on which I wished to have access to computing capability—which I know is there, but don't know how to get to. I think the means to do so should have been made available and the instructions for doing so provided. Specifically, I would like to be able to sort small files, to execute small FORTRAN programs, etc.

- The only improvement I would suggest for another demonstration would be a more concentrated teaching of the operation of the machine. The short training session was "by guess and by gosh." The TI people were much too technical, and most of the information received by us was far over our heads at that particular time. We needed to know how to turn on, sign on, and get into EIES with a few simple instructions. To spend so much time learning how to plug it in, unfasten it, etc. was unnecessary.

Q3) Any other comments on the EIES system or its impacts, or on this questionnaire?

- I thoroughly enjoyed using EIES; found it helpful; strongly urge that people not be included in group projects if their usage is going to be grudging or minimal. We had one person in my conference who did not even accept a terminal. It greatly reduced the ability of the Subcommittee to use EIES, since the data, etc., had to then be duplicated in another form for her. And, of course, she could not interact with any of us other than via phone or mail.

- I guess my simplest encomium for the system is to say: "I wish I could figure out some way to get into a project or other means of using EIES again."

- As I've indicated to the WHCLIS staff, I wish that EIES had been integrated into the White House Conference process itself, rather than simply being an appendage. The means were there to do so.

- I find relinquishing the terminal to be a cause of depression. I'm going to miss the exchanges with others on the system.

- It was all great fun. Yes! I hope to be on EIES again . . . somehow.

- The Advisory Committee has concluded its advising, its worrying, its work, and disbanded. In the pleasant glow of contemplation about the success of the Conference, I really did not feel like a disbanded Committee member, not even after returning from our final Committee meeting earlier this month. But now the Federal Express man has come and made off with my Texas Instruments terminal, and I am able to recognize the plain, cold truth. Working with the Conference staff and the Advisory Committee was a great experience for me, and the wonder of the EIES system contributed a great deal to that experience. It was exciting, and I think it might have been exciting even to one who was at home with computers (which I was not). Surely no group of geographically separated persons of varied interests and abilities ever had better communication than we did.

- I thank EIES and TI for letting me be a part of this great experiment and will boost the new process to the best of my ability, for I think that is what is important in this world — the ability to get information and communication in the most rapid way to the most people.

- I was glad to participate! I found the experience useful.

- EIES has, of course, radically altered my profession and perceptions in many ways, by thrusting me into a here-and-now world of computers and telecommunications that 10 years ago was only the subject for my writing and speeches about the "future." Which came first has been a difficult game since the first early bird laid the egg, but my impression is that EIES pushed me in the direction of greater productivity and analysis (rather than my predisposition in those directions propelling me to EIES).

- The wonderful world of EIES drew me into the system. As a way to expose a work force (or oneself) to computers and telecommunications with hands-on experience, it is very nearly unbeatable. It is possible that the enthusiasm for life it generates spills over into increased productivity in executing the task at hand. But there is also a high probability that it does not. There is also a possibility, of course, that my experience/practice is unique. However full my days, I write my own job description. I simply rewrote my assignment to include a heavy dose of "learning computers." It may be that the number of people who have that freedom, and respond to EIES with that degree of unrestrained, boyish enthusiasm, are statistically insignificant.

APPENDIX B

TABLE 1
WHCLIS CONFERENCE TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

Conference	Date	# Members	# New CC's	Mean Lines in CC	# Diff. Authors	Percent Read				
						80-100	60-79	40-59	20-39	0-19
C26 WHCLIS Information	7/31	18	2	1	1	50%	-	-	-	50%
	8/31	38	23	34	9	53	3	3	13	29
	9/30	40	51	19	15	72	-	2	2	22
	10/31	40	24	14	12	78	-	5	-	18
	11/30	40	15	17	11	88	-	5	-	8
	12/31	38	-	-	-	87	3	3	-	8
C264 WHCLIS Delegate Preparation	7/31	20	7	30	3	20	5	-	5	70
	8/31	21	9	42	1	38	24	5	-	33
	9/30	21	9	18	3	62	5	5	5	24
	10/31	21	1	9	1	76	-	5	-	19
	11/30	21	-	-	-	86	-	-	-	14
	12/31	20	-	-	-	85	-	-	-	15
C265 WHCLIS Program Committee	7/31	14	4	16	1	28	21	-	-	50
	8/31	18	23	28	3	67	6	-	-	28
	9/30	21	8	25	2	71	5	-	5	19
	10/31	21	1	9	1	71	5	-	5	19
	11/30	21	-	-	-	76	5	-	5	14
	12/31	20	-	-	-	75	5	-	5	15
C266 WHCLIS Implementation	7/31	5	5	48	2	20	-	-	40	40
	8/31	11	6	14	5	67	-	-	-	33
	9/30	13	2	16	2	77	-	8	-	15
	10/31	18	13	20	6	67	6	6	6	17
	11/30	18	-	-	-	83	-	6	-	11
	12/31	17	-	-	-	88	-	6	-	6
C270 WHCLIS Public Relations	7/31	11	1	13	1	54	-	-	-	45
	8/31	12	2	38	2	33	50	-	-	17
	9/30	13	9	30	5	77	8	-	-	15
	10/31	15	2	56	1	80	7	-	-	13
	11/30	15	1	51	1	87	-	7	-	7
	12/31	15	-	-	-	93	-	-	-	7
C271 WHCLIS Delegate Selection	7/31	10	2	10	1	50	-	-	-	50
	8/31	12	13	53	1	67	-	-	-	33
	9/30	13	4	10	3	85	-	-	-	15
	10/31	16	8	22	3	81	-	-	-	19
	11/30	16	2	27	1	94	-	-	-	6
	12/31	16	-	-	-	95	-	-	-	5
C272 WHCLIS Conference Information Center	7/31	17	11	36	2	18	-	6	12	65
	8/31	18	39	20	5	67	-	-	11	22
	9/30	19	3	3	2	79	-	-	5	16
	10/31	20	1	18	1	85	-	-	-	15
	11/30	20	-	-	-	85	-	-	-	15
	12/31	19	-	-	-	84	-	-	-	16
C288 WHCLIS Logistics	9/30	17	26	25	5	59	-	-	-	41
	10/31	17	11	17	3	65	-	6	-	29
	11/30	17	3	23	2	82	-	-	-	18
	12/31	16	-	-	-	81	-	-	-	19
C231 WHCLIS Evaluation	11/30	22	2	9	2	18	-	41	-	41
	12/31	21	5	10	4	24	10	10	-	57
C279 Citizen Groups	10/31	9	2	12	2	89	-	-	-	11
	11/30	9	-	-	-	89	-	-	-	11
	12/31	9	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-
C290 The Role of EIES at WHCLIS	8/31	13	25	17	9	77	-	-	-	23
	9/30	18	30	18	10	78	6	-	-	17
	10/31	20	60	16	12	90	5	-	-	5
	11/30	23	42	18	12	78	13	4	-	4
	12/31	22	-	-	-	95	-	-	-	4

TABLE 2
WHCLIS NOTEBOOK TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

Notebook	Date	# New Pages	Mean Lines In NP	# Diff. Authors
N272	7/31	1	32	1
Exhibits	8/31	2	40	1
N258 TI Terminal	7/31	4	36	1
N237 EIES	9/30	2	7	1
at WHCLIS	10/31	36	13	7
Notebook	11/30	43	13	5
N290 WHCLIS Keyword Data	11/30	16	34	3

TABLE 3
TIME OF INITIAL SIGN-ON

	Before 6/15	6/15 6/30	6/1-7/16	7/16-7/30	8/1-9/18	Total
Staff	7	-	1	-	-	8
Advisory Committee	-	9	2	9	1	21
Observers	5*	3	-	-	4	12
TOTAL	12	12	3	9	5	41

*EIES Observers

TABLE 4
TOTAL NUMBER OF ACTIVE USERS PER MONTH

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff	7	8	8	7	7	6	6	8 (22%)
Advisory Committee	8	16	15	17	16	19	18	21 (58%)
Observers	2	2	7	6	4	7	4	7 (19%)
TOTAL	17	26	30	30	27	32	28	36 (100%)

TABLE 5
TOTAL HOURS ON LINE BY MONTH (PER ACTIVE USER)

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff	24	32	119	77	52	17	19	340 (38%)
Advisory Committee	8	38	87	69	74	60	13	349 (40%)
Observers	10	24	28	32	41	43	15	193 (22%)
TOTAL	42	94	234	178	167	120	47	882 (100%)

TABLE 6
TOTAL NUMBER OF SIGN-ONS BY MONTH (PER ACTIVE USER)

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff	82	118	336	198	174	48	27	983 (26%)
Advisory Committee	20	195	420	304	321	253	71	1584 (42%)
Observers	40	250	180	169	248	237	90	1214 (32%)
TOTAL	142	563	936	671	743	538	188	3781 (100%)

TABLE 7
LENGTH OF AVERAGE ON-LINE SESSION IN MINUTES BY MONTH (PER ACTIVE USER)

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff	18	16	21	23	18	21	42	21
Advisory Committee	24	12	12	14	14	14	11	13
Observers	15	6	9	11	10	11	10	10
TOTAL	18	10	15	16	13	13	15	14

TABLE 8
TOTAL NUMBER OF PRIVATE MESSAGE ADDRESSEES BY MONTH (PER ACTIVE USER)

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff	87 (6)	180 (8)	596 (8)	227 (7)	225 (7)	54 (4)	22 (4)	1391 (40%)
Advisory Committee	20 (8)	244 (16)	345 (13)	226 (11)	252 (11)	145 (13)	57 (7)	1289 (37%)
Observers	56 (2)	174 (1)	166 (7)	50 (4)	114 (4)	184 (3)	56 (3)	800 (23%)
TOTAL	163 (16)	598 (25)	1107 (28)	503 (22)	591 (22)	383 (20)	135 (14)	3480 (100%)

TABLE 9
GENERAL USER STATISTICS

PRIVATE MESSAGES

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff:								
Composed	67 (6)	92 (8)	265 (8)	124 (7)	167 (7)	38 (4)	14 (4)	767
Received	183 (7)	237 (8)	649 (8)	247 (7)	251 (7)	96 (6)	79 (6)	1742
Adv. Comm.:								
Composed	18 (8)	111 (16)	184 (13)	147 (11)	147 (11)	97 (13)	51 (8)	755
Received	27 (8)	185 (16)	471 (15)	301 (17)	306 (16)	214 (18)	109 (15)	1613
Observers:								
Composed	24 (2)	85 (1)	75 (5)	42 (4)	88 (4)	62 (3)	32 (3)	408
Received	54 (2)	151 (1)	185 (6)	151 (6)	116 (4)	110 (7)	40 (3)	807
Total:								
Composed	109	288	524	313	402	197	97	1930
Received	264	573	1305	699	673	420	228	4162

Table 9 (continued)

GROUP MESSAGES

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff:								
Composed	-	-	21 (4)	3 (2)	-	-	-	24
Received	36 (7)	59 (8)	230 (8)	122 (7)	8 (7)	14 (4)	19 (4)	488
Adv. Comm.:								
Composed	-	2 (1)	6 (2)	10 (5)	-	1 (1)	-	19
Received	2 (2)	48 (16)	429 (15)	329 (17)	82 (16)	64 (15)	19 (5)	973
Observers:								
Composed	-	-	-	-	-	1 (1)	-	1
Received	3 (1)	3 (1)	61 (4)	158 (6)	5 (4)	43 (7)	8 (2)	281
Total:								
Composed	-	2	27	13	-	2	-	44
Received	41	110	720	609	95	121	46	1742

PRIVATE AND GROUP CONFERENCES

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff:								
Composed	11 (3)	15 (5)	91 (7)	101 (7)	41 (7)	15 (6)	-	274
Received	85 (1)	52 (7)	741 (8)	1045 (7)	671 (7)	254 (5)	267 (3)	3115
Adv. Comm.								
Composed	-	2 (2)	12 (7)	20 (8)	73 (8)	17 (6)	-	124
Received	-	19 (6)	490 (13)	1172 (16)	744 (15)	846 (17)	28 (6)	3299
Observers:								
Composed	-	-	-	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (2)	-	6
Received	7 (1)	-	262 (2)	575 (4)	581 (4)	486 (7)	49 (3)	1960
Total:								
Composed	11	17	103	122	116	35	-	404
Received	92	71	1493	2792	1996	1586	344	8374

PUBLIC CONFERENCES

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff:								
Composed	-	-	-	2 (1)	-	-	1 (1)	3
Received	2 (1)	138 (3)	7 (2)	52 (3)	-	-	467 (1)	666
Adv. Comm.:								
Composed	-	-	1 (1)	6 (2)	8 (1)	4 (1)	1 (1)	20
Received	-	12 (1)	51 (2)	349 (8)	535 (5)	134 (5)	96 (3)	1177
Observers:								
Composed	-	3 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	3
Received	-	16 (1)	1 (1)	75 (3)	97 (1)	25 (2)	18 (1)	232
Total:								
Composed	-	3	1	8	8	4	2	26
Received	2	166	59	476	632	159	581	2075

Table 9 (continued)
NOTEBOOKS

	June	July	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Staff:								
Composed	1 (1)	2 (1)	3 (2)	-	-	-	-	6
Received	24 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	24
Adv. Comm.								
Composed	-	2 (1)	-	-	-	14 (2)	-	16
Received	-	-	-	-	-	15 (1)	-	15
Observers:								
Composed	1 (1)	11 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	12
Received	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:								
Composed	2	15	3	-	-	14	-	34
Received	24	-	-	-	-	15	-	39

TABLE 10
FREQUENCY OF TYPES OF USER REQUESTS

Category	Number
General Usage Problems	396
Conferencing	275
Messaging	53
Text Composition	59
Notebooks	18
Special Features and Miscellaneous	100
TOTAL	901

TABLE 11
TIME SPAN OF PROBLEMS

Date	Number of Requests
5/ 2- 5/15	6
5/16- 5/31	-
6/ 1- 6/15	25
6/16- 6/30	52
7/ 1- 7/15	28
7/16- 7/31	58
8/16- 8/31	103
9/ 1- 9/15	40
9/16- 9/30	50
10/ 1-10/15	32
10/16-10/31	36
11/ 1-11/15	26
11/16-11/30	10
12/ 1-12/15	10
12/16-12/31	10
TOTAL	486

TABLE 12
NUMBER OF REQUESTS PER USER

	Number of Requests	Number of Users
	12-19	17
	21-30	8
	33-50	5
	53-70	5
	104	1
TOTAL	1090	36

TABLE 13
AMOUNT OF TIME ON LINE BY NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR HELP

Number of Requests	Number of Hours on Line		
	1-15	17-29	Total
12-30	17 (94%)	8 (44%)	25
33-104	1 (6%)	10 (56%)	11
TOTAL	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	36

TABLE 14
TYPING SKILLS BY TIME USED ON LINE

Q.6: How would you describe your typing skills?

	Number	Hours on Line
None	1	19.7
Hunt and Peck	3	20.9
Casual (rough draft with errors)	7	42.6
Good (can do 25 w.p.m. error free)	3	31.8
Excellent (can do 40 w.p.m. error free)	6	37.1

TABLE 15
PREVIOUS USE OF COMPUTERS AND TERMINALS BY TIME USED ON LINE

Q.8: Have you ever used computers or computer terminals before?

	Number	Hours on Line
Never	8	28.5
Seldom	7	40.4
Frequently	5	38.5

TABLE 16
ANTICIPATED WORTH OF EIES BY TIME USED ON LINE

Q.18: Which of the following best describes your anticipation of the System's worth?

	Number	Hours on Line
I think it will be useless	-	-
I think it is useful for others, but not for WHCLIS	-	-
I am skeptical about it but willing to try it	-	-
I am basically indifferent or neutral	-	-
I think it will have limited, but some worth for WHCLIS	6	19.8
I think it will be useful in many respects	8	25.4
I think it will revolutionize WHCLIS's work/communication processes	6	63.5

TABLE 17
ANTICIPATED RELATIVE TIME BY TIME USED ON LINE

Q.19: Compared to the conventional means of communicating with the WHCLIS Advisory Committee and staff, do you expect EIES to:

	Number	Hours on Line
Involve less of your time	8	45.3
Involve more of your time	9	29.3

TABLE 18
COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIPS BY TIME ON LINE

	Number	Hours on Line
Increased in Number	5	47.1
No Change	8	36.3
Decreased in Number	1	4.2

TABLE 19
PERSONAL FRIENDSHIPS BY TIME ON LINE

	Number	Hours on Line
No Change	4	16.3
Increased by 1	2	28.1
Increased 2-6	10	39.7

TABLE 20
REPORTED FREQUENCY OF SIGN-ON BY ACTUAL SIGN-ONS AND TIME ON LINE

	Number	Mean Number of Sign-ons	Hours on Line
2-3 times a month	1	19	9.4
Once a week	4	25	8.3
2-3 times a week	9	144	39.9
Daily	3	108	24.4
Several times a day	4	402	58.0

TABLE 21
EXPECTED VS. ACTUAL SIGN-ONS

	EXPECTED				
	2-3 Times a Month	Once a Week	2-3 Times a Week	Daily	Several Times a Day
ACTUAL					
2-3 Times a Month	-	-	-	-	-
Once a Week	-	-	2	-	-
2-3 Times a Week	2	-	2	4	-
Daily	-	1	2	-	-
Several Times a Day	-	-	-	1	2

TABLE 22
MODE OF INTERACTION BY TIME ON LINE

	Number	Hours on Line
Typed it themselves	15	37.9
Both	3	20.1
Had it typed	1	6.6

TABLE 23
CHANGES IN EVALUATION OF SYSTEM OVER TIME

	TIME 1				
	Skeptical	Neutral	Limited Worth	Useful	Revolutionary
TIME 2					
Limited Worth	-	-	2	2	-
Useful	1	1	-	1	-
Revolutionary	-	-	2	3	3

TABLE 24
EVALUATION OF SYSTEM BY TIME ON LINE

	Number	Hours on Line
Skeptical	1	9.4
Limited Worth	5	31.4
Useful	6	27.1
Revolutionary	8	46.9

TABLE 25
CHANGES IN COMPARATIVE TIME OVER TIME

	TIME 1 Less Time	More Time	Same Amount	Total
TIME 2				
Less Time	1	3	-	4
More Time	3	2	1	6
Same Amount	1	2	-	3
TOTAL	5	7	1	13

TABLE 26
COMPARATIVE TIME BY TIME ON LINE

	Number	Hours on Line
EIES involved less time	7	23.0
EIES involved more time	6	60.7
Same amount	3	16.0

TABLE 27
IMPACT ON QUALITY BY IMPACT ON QUANTITY OF WORK

	QUALITY INCREASED Agreed	Neither	Disagreed	Total
QUANTITY INCREASED				
Agreed	6	3	-	9
Neither	-	5	-	5
Disagreed	-	1	2	3
TOTAL	6	9	2	17

TABLE 28
IMPACT ON QUALITY OF WORK BY TIME ON LINE

Quality Increased	Number	Hours on Line
Agreed	7	46.9
Neither	9	25.6
Disagreed	2	31.2

TABLE 29
IMPACT ON QUANTITY OF WORK BY TIME ON LINE

Quantity Increased	Number	Hours on Line
Agreed	9	39.2
Neither	5	27.9
Disagreed	4	25.0

TABLE 30
EFFECTS ON TELEPHONE, MAIL, AND TRAVEL

	TELEPHONE			
	Decreased		No Effect	
	MAILS		MAILS	
	Decreased	No Effect	Decreased	No Effect
TRAVEL				
Decreased	4	1	3	1
No Effect	1	1	-	4

TABLE 31
IMPACT ON THINKING AND WORKING BY TIME ON LINE

	Number	Hours on Line
Reported an Impact	12	40.5
Reported no Impact	5	22.6

TABLE 32
CUMULATIVE USAGE STATISTICS FOR SEVEN MONTHS

	Items/Lines Composed	Items/Lines Received
Messages:		
Private	1896/15596	1610/16941
Group	46/ 397	121/ 1436
Conferences:		
Private	714/ 6122	766/17084
Public	31/ 640	531/10089
Notebooks:		
Private	193/ 3939	73/ 1646
Public	1/ 32	13/ 375
Total Number of Times On:		1528
Total Hours of Use		513
Total Private Message Addressees		3129

Publications and Media Produced by the Conference

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Bringing Information to People.* Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, May 1979. Poster.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Issues and Resolutions: A Summary of Pre-Conference Activities.* Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, September 1979. 96 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Issues and Resolutions: A Summary of Pre-Conference Activities Graphic Presentation.* Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, September 1979. Chart.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Library and Information Services for Meeting Personal Needs; A Discussion Guide,* by Patricia Glass Schuman. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 44 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Library and Information Services for Enhancing Lifelong Learning: A Discussion Guide,* by R. Kathleen Molz. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 41 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Library and Information Services for Improving Organizations and the Professions; A Discussion Guide,* by Karen E. Feingold. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 29 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Library and Information Services for Effectively Governing Society; A Discussion Guide,* by Susan Crooks. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 41 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Library and Information Services for Increasing International Understanding and Cooperation; A Discussion Guide,* by Jonathon F. Gunter. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 30 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Structure and Governance of Library Networks; Issues for Consideration,* by Thomas J. Galvin. Pre-Conference Meetings on Special Themes. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 12 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Libraries and Literacy; A Summary Report,* by Marcia Courtney Bellassai. Pre-Conference Meetings on Special Themes. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 11 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *International Information Exchange; A Theme Conference Summary*, by Robert Lee Chartrand and Jane Bortnick. Pre-Conference Meetings on Special Themes. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 18 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *New Communication and Information Technologies and Their Application to Individual and Community Use; A Theme Conference*, by National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 9 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Federal Funding Alternatives*, by Alphonse F. Trezza. Pre-Conference Meetings on Special Themes. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 17 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Dialogues on the Future of Library and Information Services*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 3 audiotapes.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *The Reference Book Collection of the Conference Information Center*, compiled by Margaret E. Melun. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, October 1979. 35 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Program Book*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, November 1979. 56 pp.

White House Conference on Library and Information Services, 1979. *Bringing Information to People*. March 1980. Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, March 1980. 20 min. videotape.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1980 O - 324-838 : QL 3